



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







Calculus

AN
HISTORICAL VIEW
OF
THE STATE
OF THE
PROTESTANT DISSENTERS
IN ENGLAND,

*And of the Progress of Free Enquiry and
Religious Liberty,*

FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE ACCESSION
OF QUEEN ANNE.

BY JOSHUA TOULMIN, D. D.

PRINTED BY
RICHARD CRUTTWELL, ST. JAMES'S-STREET, BATH;
AND SOLD BY
LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWNE, PATERNOSTER-
ROW, LONDON.

1814.



141 . 4 . 333 .

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

- A** BEL Rev. David, *Bardon*
 Aldersey Mr. *Chester*
 Aldersey Mr. William, *Chester*
 Aldersey Mr. Robert, *Chester*
 Aldridge Geo. esq; *Christchurch*
 Alexander Dr. *Leicester*
 Allard Rev. William, *Bury*
 Allcock Mr. John, *Gatley, near*
Stockport
 Amphlet Mr. William, *East*
Haddon, Northamptonshire
 Anstis Rev. Matthew, *Bridport*
 Ashton Mr. Joseph, *Stockport*
 Ashton Mr. Samuel, *Stockport*
 Ashton Mr. Thomas, *Hyde, near*
Stockport
 Ashworth Mr. C. *Bolton*
 Astley Rev. Richard, *Halifax*
 Awbrey Rev. R. *Swansea*
 Awbrey Mr. Richard, *Swansea,*
2 copies
- Bache Miss, *Birmingham*
 Badland Mr. Jas. *Kidderminster*
 Badley Mr. J. surgeon, *Dudley*
 Bagnall Rev. J. *Carmarthen*
- Baker Mr. John, *Ilminster*
 Baker Mr. George, *Northampton*
 Bankart Mr. T. jun. *Leicester*
 Barber Stephen, esq; *Cornhill,*
London
 Baron Mr. Peter, *Cockey-Moor,*
2 copies
 Barr Mr. *Birmingham, 2 copies*
 Barrow Mr. *Stockport*
 Barton Mrs. *Stoke-Newington*
 Batsford Mr. S. *Bilston*
 Batten, Mr. James, *Plymouth-*
Dock
 Batten Mr. Edmund, *Yeovil*
 Bealey Mr. Rich. *Cockey-Moor*
 Beasley Rev. T. E. *Uxbridge*
 Beavon Mr. Thomas, *Boston*
 Beck Peter, esq; *Shrewsbury*
 Bedford Mr. *Lincoln*
 Belsham, Rev. T. *London, 2*
copies
 Bentley John, esq; *Stockport*
 Berry Rev. Charles, *Leicester*
 Birt Rev. Isaiah, *Birmingham*
 Blake Rev. W. *Crewkerne*
 Blake Malachi, M. D. *Taunton*

- | | |
|---|--|
| Blake Mrs. <i>Taunton</i> | Browne Rev. Theop. <i>Congleton</i> |
| Blake Mr. D. <i>Holway</i> | Browne Mr. R. <i>Bridgwater</i> |
| Blakeway Mr. W. <i>Birmingham</i> | Browne Mr. Henry, <i>Lewes</i> |
| Blount Mr. <i>Birmingham</i> | Buncombe John, esq; <i>Taunton</i> |
| Blyth Mr. Robert, <i>Birmingham</i> | Burkitt Mr. Miles, <i>Southwark</i> |
| Blyth Mr. G. <i>Birmingham</i> | Bury Jeremiah, esq; <i>Stockport</i> |
| Blyth Mr. Henry, <i>Birmingham</i> | Butcher Rev. Edmund, <i>Sidmouth</i> |
| Blyth Mr. R. B. <i>Edinburgh</i> | Buxton Miss, <i>Nottingham</i> |
| Blyth Mr. <i>Edinburgh</i> | Buxton Mr. John, <i>Northampton</i> |
| Bolton Mr. Thomas, <i>Liverpool</i> | |
| Bonington Mr. <i>Nottingham</i> | Calamy Edmund, esq; <i>Topsham</i> |
| Book Society, <i>Northampton</i> | Capon John, esq; <i>Taunton</i> |
| Bowring Mr. Benjamin, <i>Exeter</i> | Cappe Mrs. <i>York</i> |
| Boult Mr. William, <i>Exeter</i> | Carpenter Rev. B. <i>Oldswinford</i> |
| Bradshaw Mr. <i>Wolverhampton</i> | Carpenter Rev. Lant, LL. D. |
| Branby Rev. J. H. <i>Dudley</i> , 3
copies. | <i>Exeter</i> , for himself and friends,
10 copies. |
| Brent Samuel, esq; <i>Blackheath</i> | Carpenter M. Ph. <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Brent John, esq; <i>Greenland Dock</i> | Carpenter Mr. W. <i>Honiton</i> |
| Brent Mr. <i>Portsea</i> | Carter Mr. S. <i>Coventry</i> |
| Bretland, Rev. Joseph, <i>Exeter</i> | Carter Mr. W. <i>Portsmouth</i> |
| Brewin Mrs. <i>Leicester</i> | Carter Mr. Edward, <i>Portsmouth</i> |
| Briggs Rawdon, esq; <i>Halifax</i> | Case Rev. G. <i>Shrewsbury</i> |
| Bristowe Rev. J. Bull, <i>Hinckley</i> | Chatfield John, esq; <i>Brighton</i> |
| Bristowe Mr. <i>Poole</i> | Clark Mr. Thos. <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Broadhurst Rev. T. <i>Bath</i> , 2
copies | Clark Mr. W. <i>Coventry</i> |
| Brook Rev. Mr. <i>Tutbury</i> | Clark Mr. John, <i>Coventry</i> |
| Brook Mr. <i>Lincoln</i> | Clarke J. W. esq; near <i>Plymouth</i> |
| Brooks Rev. James, <i>Hyde</i> , near
<i>Stockport</i> | Clarke T. T. esq; <i>Swakeley-house</i> ,
<i>Uxbridge</i> |
| Broom Mr. H. <i>Kidderminster</i> | Clarkson Rd. esq; <i>Fairwater</i> |
| Brown William, esq; <i>Collumpton</i> | Coates Mr. M. <i>Gainsborough</i> |
| Brown Miss, <i>Collumpton</i> | Cogan Rev. Eli, <i>Walthamstow</i> |
| Brown Mr. William, jun. <i>Col-
lumpton</i> | Coldham Geo. esq; <i>Nottingham</i> |
| Brown Timothy, esq; <i>London</i> | Cole Mr. <i>Leicester</i> |
| Brownbill Mr. Nathaniel, <i>Chorley</i> | Cole Mr. Thomas, <i>Bridgwater</i> |
| | Colfox Thomas, esq; <i>Bridport</i> |
| | Colfox Mr. W. <i>Bridport</i> |

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Collins Mr. John, jun. <i>Horton</i> | Cropper Mr. <i>Chester</i> |
| Collins A. esq; <i>Birmingham</i> | Crosby Mr. <i>Portsea</i> |
| Colmore Miss S. <i>Birmingham</i> | Cudlipp Mr. R. C. <i>Tavistock</i> |
| Coltman John, esq; <i>Leicester</i> | Cunliffe Mr. James, <i>Bolton</i> |
| Coltman Mr. John, <i>Leicester</i> | Curtis Mr. W. bookseller, |
| Coltman Mr. <i>Leicester</i> | <i>Plymouth</i> |
| Cooke William, esq; <i>Newport</i> | |
| <i>Isle of Wight</i> | Daniell John, esq; <i>Yeovil</i> |
| Cooke Mr. Thomas, <i>ditto</i> | Daniell Mr. Peter, <i>Yeovil</i> |
| Cookworthy Dr. <i>Plymouth</i> | Daniels Mr. Samuel, <i>Sheffield</i> |
| Coombs Mr. W. <i>Plymouth-Dock</i> | Darbishire Mr. J. <i>Manchester</i> |
| Cordy Mr. John, <i>Worlingworth</i> | Darbishire Mr. Robt. <i>Bolton</i> |
| Cornish Rev. Joseph, <i>Colyton</i> | Davies Rev. Henry, <i>Taunton</i> |
| Corrie Rev. John, <i>Handsworth</i> | Davies David, esq; <i>Trawsmawr,</i> |
| Corrie Mr. Josiah, <i>Birmingham</i> | <i>Carmarthenshire</i> |
| Cotton Bayes, esq; <i>Kenilworth</i> | Davis Rev. John, <i>Collumpton</i> |
| Cotton Mr. Edward, <i>Kenilworth</i> | Davis Rev. D. <i>Parade, Neath,</i> |
| Cotton Mr. Thos. <i>Kenilworth</i> | 3 copies |
| Cotton Mr. W. H. <i>Basinghall-</i> | Davis Rev. Timothy, <i>Coventry</i> |
| <i>street, London</i> | Davy Mr. Isaac, <i>Fordton</i> |
| Cotton Mr. Samuel, <i>ditto</i> | Daw Mr. Ambrose, <i>Christchurch</i> |
| Coulston T. esq; <i>Plymouth-Dock</i> | Deacon Rev. J. <i>Leicester</i> |
| <i>Yard</i> | Disney John, D. D. <i>The Hyde,</i> |
| Cox Mr. J. P. <i>Plymouth</i> | 6 copies |
| Cox Mr. S. M. Attorney-at-law, | Disney Miss, <i>The Hyde</i> |
| <i>Exeter</i> | Dissenters' Book-Club, <i>Bury S</i> |
| Cox Mr. Isaac, <i>Honiton</i> | <i>Edmund's</i> |
| Crawford Mr. W. <i>Devonshire-</i> | Downe Mr. Nathaniel, surgeon, |
| <i>square, London</i> | <i>Bridport</i> |
| Crawford Mrs. J. <i>Bath</i> | Drummond Rev. T. <i>Derby</i> |
| Cree Mr. Robt. <i>Plymouth-Dock</i> | Duckworth G. esq; <i>Manchester</i> |
| Crompton Dr. <i>Eaton House, near</i> | Dunning Richard, esq; <i>Plymouth</i> |
| <i>Liverpool</i> | Dunsford Mr. S. <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Crompton Mr. J. <i>Birmingham</i> | |
| Crompton Abraham, esq; <i>Chor-</i> | Eaton Mr. <i>Shrewsbury</i> |
| <i>ley, 5 copies</i> | Edmonds J. B. esq; <i>South-</i> |
| Crompton Mr. B. <i>Bury</i> | <i>Petherton</i> |
| Crook Mr. John, <i>Rechdale</i> | Edwards Rev. A. <i>Dorchester</i> |

- Edwards Mr. John, *Dorchester*
 Elliott John, esq; *Sopley, near Christchurch*
 Elson Mr. Carboneer, *Newfoundland*
 Ely Rev. Charles, *Bury*
 England Mr. Stephen, *West-Lambrook*
 Estlin Rev. Dr. *Bristol*, 2 copies
 Evans Rev. W. *Tavistock*, 2 copies
 Evans Rev. J. A. M. *Islington*
 Evans Rev. John, *Ilminster*
 Evans Rev. John, *Bristol*
 Evans Mr. J. bookseller, *Carmarthen*
 Fawcett Rev. Sam. *Yeovil*
 Fellowes John, esq; *Nottingham*
 Fenner Rev. J. L. *Taunton*
 Field Rev. W. *Warwick*
 Fisher Mr. John, *Dorchester*
 Fisher Mr. Thomas, *Dorchester*, 2 copies
 Fisher Mr. Thos. jun. *Dorchester*
 Florance Jas. esq; *Chichester*
 Follet Rev. John, *Topsbam*
 Follet Mr. A. *Sidmouth*
 Foot Mrs. *Bristol*
 Forster Mr. *Bromley*
 Fox George. esq; near *Falmouth*
 Fox Rev. W. J. *Chichester*, 2 copies
 Francis Mr. Thos. *Birmingham*
 Francis Mr. *Swallow-street, London*
 Freeman S. esq; *Coventry*
 Freme J. R. esq; *Liverpool*
 Fry Rev. R. *Kidderminster*
 Fullagar John, esq; *Newport, Isle of Wight*
 Garfitt William, esq; *Boston*, 3 copies
 Garfitt Mr. *Gainsborough*
 Gaskell Benjamin, esq; *Thorne's House*
 Gaskell Daniel, esq; *Lupport-Hall*
 Geary Rev. John, jun. *Beaconsfield*
 Gibbs Mr. Silv. *Plymouth-Dock*
 Giffard Rev. Chas. *Ilminster*
 Godwin Mr. bookseller, *Bath*
 Gollop G. T. esq; *Yeovil*
 Goode Mr. *Leicester*
 Goore Wm. esq; *Liverpool*
 Gouger Mr. John, *Sherborne*
 Gouger Mr. *Ironmonger-lane, London*
 Gough Mr. John, jun. *Kidderminster*
 Greenhows Mr. J. *Walthamstow*
 Griffiths Mr. W. merchant, *Carmarthen*
 Grove Mr. Edw. *Kidderminster*
 Grundy Rev. J. *Manchester*
 Grundy Joshua, esq; *Oaks*
 Grundy John, jun. esq; *Bury*
 Grundy Edmund, esq; *Bury*
 Grundy Mr. Edm. *Hollies, Bury*
 Grundy Mr. J. *Moorfide, Bury*
 Gundry Mr. Joseph, *Bridport*
 Gundry Mr. Samuel, *Bridport*
 Gurney John, esq; *Serjeant's-Inn, London*
 Gunn Rev. Dan. *Bishop's-Hall*

- Guy Rev. Joseph, *Birmingham*
 Hallet John, esq; *Miferton, near Crewkerne*
 Halliday Miss, *Tard, near Taunton*
 Halliday Miss Eliza, *ditto*
 Halliday Miss Prudence, *ditto*
 Hancock Mr. *Nottingham*
 Harper Mr. Jos. *Birmingham*
 Harries Mrs. *Arscot*
 Harrison Rev. J. *Kendal*
 Harrop Mrs. Mary, *Shrewsbury*
 Hart R. C. esq; *Shrewsbury*
 Hafelden Mr. J. *Bolton*
 Hassal Rev. William, *Rochdale, 2 copies*
 Hastings Mr. Wm. *Rochdale*
 Hawes Mr. Thos. *Old Barge-House, London*
 Hawes Mr. Benjamin, *Old Barge-House, London*
 Hawker Miss, *Taunton*
 Hawker Mr. *Shrewsbury*
 Hawkes Rev. Wm. *Manchester*
 Hawker Mr. T. L. *Birmingham*
 Hawker Rev. James, *Lincoln, 2 copies*
 Hawksley Mr. Thos. *Sheffield*
 Hayward Mr. G. *Poole*
 Heinekin Rev. T. N. *Gainsborough*
 Herbert Mr. Abel, *Coventry*
 Herbert Mr. Lewis, *Neath*
 Hesketh Mr. Edw. *Birmingham*
 Heywood Mrs. *Gainsborough*
 Heywood Mr. R. *Bolton*
 Heywood Benj. esq; *Stanley-Hall*
 Heywood J. P. esq; *Wakefield*
 Higginson Rev. E. *Derby*
 Highmore Anthony, esq; *King-street, Cheapside, London*
 Higman Mr. *Plymouth-Dock*
 Hinckley Henry, esq; *Guildford-street, London*
 Hodgson Mr. *Gainsborough*
 Holden J. esq; *Brighton*
 Holden Rev. L. *Tenterden*
 Holden Jos. jun. esq; *Tenterden*
 Holland Rev. J. *Bolton*
 Holt Rev. J. *Cirencester*
 Holt Mr. Thomas, *Liverpool*
 Hone Mr. Joseph, *Dublin*
 Hopkins Mr. W. jun. *Kidderminster*
 Hornblower Mr. Thomas, *Birmingham*
 Hornbrook Mr. S. *Tavistock, 2 copies*
 Horsey Rev. J. *Northampton*
 Hort Rev. W. J. *Bristol*
 Horton Mr. John, *Kidderminster*
 Houghton Rev. P. *Liverpool*
 Hounsell Mr. Wm. *Bridport*
 Hounsell Mr. Thomas, *Bridport*
 Hounsell Miss, *East-street, Bridport*
 Howe Rev. Thomas, *Bridport*
 Howell Mrs. Catherine, *Swansea*
 Howse H. E. esq; *Lyncombe, near Bath*
 Hughes Mrs. *Hanwood, 2 copies*
 Hughes Mrs. Mary, *Hanwood, 2 copies*
 Hughes Mr. M. B. *Dudley*
 Hughes Rev. James, *Honiton*

- | | |
|---|--|
| Hughes Mr. <i>Shrewsbury</i> | Johns Rev. W. <i>Manchester</i> , |
| Hughes Mr. Chas. <i>Shrewsbury</i> | 2 copies |
| Hughes Mr. Job Orton, <i>Bury</i> | Johnston Rev W. <i>Lewes</i> |
| Humphry Mr. John, <i>West-Lambrook</i> | Johnstone Mr. <i>Bath</i> |
| Hunt Mr. Hen. <i>West-Bromwich</i> | Johnstone Rev. Thos. <i>Wakefield</i> |
| Hunter Rev. Joseph, <i>Bath</i> | Jones S. esq; <i>Greenhill, near Manchester</i> |
| Hurst Miss, <i>Leicester</i> | Jones Mr. E. <i>Wolverhampton</i> |
| Huthwaite Mrs. C. <i>Nottingham</i> | Jones Thomas, esq; <i>Shrewsbury</i> |
| Hutton Rev. Joseph, <i>Dublin</i> | Joyce Rev. J. <i>Highgate</i> , 2 copies |
| Hutton Rev. J. jun. <i>Nottingham</i> | |
| Hutton Mr. <i>Paradise-street, Birmingham</i> | Keech Mr. James, <i>Lynn</i> |
| Hyde Mrs. <i>Bath</i> , 2 copies | Keer Samuel, esq; <i>Creetingham</i> |
| Hyde Mr. <i>Gainsborough</i> | Kell Rev. Robert, <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Hyne Mr. <i>Plymouth</i> | Kenrick Rev. John, A. M. <i>York</i> |
| | Kenrick Rev. Geo. <i>Chesterfield</i> , |
| | 2 copies |
| Isaac Rev. J. <i>Moretonhampstead</i> | Kenrick Mr. A. <i>West-Bromwich</i> |
| | Kenrick Mr. S. <i>West-Bromwich</i> |
| Jackson Mr. bookseller, <i>Plymouth</i> | Kentish Rev. J. <i>Birmingham</i> , |
| Jackson Mr. <i>Wraxhall</i> | 3 copies |
| Jacob Mr. <i>Taunton</i> , 2 copies | Kershaw Wm. esq; <i>Warley house, near Halifax</i> |
| Jardine Mr. James, <i>Bury</i> | Kettle John, esq; <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Jarman J. E. esq; <i>Charter-house-square, London</i> | Kings Mrs. <i>Cirencester</i> |
| Jefferies Mr. Benjamin, <i>Dorchester</i> , 4 copies | Kingsford Sampson, esq; <i>Canterbury</i> , 6 copies |
| Jefferys Mr. John, <i>Kidderminster</i> | Kingsford M. esq; <i>Canterbury</i> |
| Jeffries Edward, esq; <i>Taunton</i> | Kirkpatrick R. G. esq; <i>Newport, Isle of Wight</i> |
| Jenkins Rev. Herbert, <i>Leicester</i> | |
| Jenkins Mr. John, <i>Middle-bank, Swansea</i> | Lamb Mr. Christopher, <i>Boston</i> |
| Jenkins Mr. John, surgeon, <i>Carmarthen</i> | Lakin Mr. <i>Leicester</i> |
| Jervis Rev. T. <i>Leeds</i> | Lamport Mr. <i>Plymouth</i> |
| Jervis Rev. John, <i>Lymington</i> | Lamport Mr. <i>Poole</i> |
| Jevons Mr. Wm. <i>Liverpool</i> | Lang Mr. S. <i>Tavistock</i> |
| Johnston Ebenezer, esq; <i>Lewes</i> | Lawrence Miss, <i>Gateacre</i> |
| | Lea Mr. W. <i>Birmingham</i> |

- Lee Thos. esq;** *Birmingham*
Lempriere Mr. J. *Portsmouth*
Lewin Rev. Robt. *Liverpool*
Lewin Robt. M. D. *Liverpool*
Lewin Mr. Wm. *Liverpool*
Lewin Mr. Edmund, *Liverpool*
Library, York College
——, Morley-street Chapel,
Manchester
——, Dissenting Chapel, Lincoln
——, Tenterden
——, Ditchling
——, Silver-street Chapel, Bury
——, Vestry, North-Gate-
End Chapel, Halifax
——, Vestry, Dissenting Cha-
pel, Cbeesterfield
——, Phoenix, Old Meeting,
Birmingham
——, Gravel-pit, Hackney
Lightbody John, esq; *Liverpool*
Lindsay James, D. D. *Old Ford,*
near London
Linthorne Capt. R. N. *Poole*
Lister Mr. *Hackney*
Littlewood Rev. Thos. *Rochdale*
Livesey Mr. Thos. *Chorley*
Lloyd Rev. Rees, *Kingswood*
Lomas Mr. James, *Cockey Moor*
Lye Mr. Geo. *West Lambrook*
- Macdonald Dr.** *Taunton*
Mace Mr. John, sen. *Tenterden*
Major Mr. *Poole*
Major Mr. Robert, *Poole*
Mann Mr. Wm. *Rochdale*
Manfell Mrs. *Birmingham*
Manfell Mrs. Sarah, *Birmingham*
- Manning Rev. James,** *Exeter,* for
 himself and friends, 10 copies
Manfell Mrs. Jud. *Birmingham*
Marder Mr. *Poole*
Marshall Rev. Jas. *Waterford*
Mather Thos. esq; *Lea Hall,*
near Macclesfield
Mather Miss, *Greenhill, near*
Manchester
Matthews Mr. W. *Bath*
Maullin Mr. Joseph, *Coseley*
Maurice Mr. W. *Dudley*
May Vaughan, M. D. *Plymouth*
Meade Mr. *Taunton*
Messenger Mr. T. *Birmingham*
Michell Miss, *Taunton*
Milligan Mr. *Hinckley*
Milner Lieut. Rowland, R. N.
Carmarthen
Milns Mr. Alexander, *Rochdale*
Montgomery Mr. *Brentford*
Moon Rev. W. *Deptford*
Moore Mr. John, *Birmingham*
Moorhouse John, esq; *Sheffield*
Morgan Miss, *Sidmouth*
Morgan M. Sam. Jones, *Neath*
Morris Rev. W *East-Lambrook*
Morris Mr. *Cockey Moor*
Moulson Mr. John, *Chester*
Moulson Mr. Richard, *Chester*
Mozley Mr. *Gainsborough*
Mun Mr. *Wolverhampton*
Murch Rev. W. *Frome*
- Nash Wm. esq;** *Roxton, Herts*
Naish Mr. *Poole*
Naish Mr. *Romsey*
Nanson Mr. Edward, *Sheffield*

New Mr. A. Evesham
New Mr. John, Evesham
Newbold Mr. W. Sheffield
Nicklin Mr. Rich. Tipton
Nicholetts John, esq; South-
Petherton
Nichols Mr. A. Stonehouse
Noble Mrs. J. Taunton, 2 copies
Norman J. esq; Plymouth-Dock
Norrish Mr. George, Moreton-
hampstead
Northey Mr. C. Tavistock
Nott Mr. George, Carmarthen
Nutt Mr. J. Leicester

Oldham Mr. S. Coventry
Oslar Mr. Thos. Bridgewater
Oslar Mr. T. jun. Birmingham
Oslar Mr. John, West Lambrook

Paget T. esq; Leicester, 2 copies
Paget T. esq; surgeon, Leicester
Paget Mr. J. Loughborough
Paget Mr. John, Loughborough
Palmer Rev. Samuel, Hackney
Pargeter Mr. Thos. Cradley
Pargeter Mr. Thos. Foxcoat
Pargeter Mr. Jos. Careless Green
Parker Rev. Samuel, Stockport
Parry Mr. William, Llethrach,
Carmarthenshire
Parry Mr. Thos. Carmarthen
Parsons Thomas, esq; Bath
Parsons Daniel, esq; Dudley
Parsons John, esq; Bridgwater,
2 copies

Partridge Miss, Stonehouse
Pas Mr. Robert, Boston

Peacock Dr. Gainsborough
Peach Mr. Sam. Northampton
Peirs Mr. C. attorney-at-law,
Plymouth
Penn Miss, Birmingham
Peter Rev. David, Carmarthen
Peyton Mr. Birmingham
Philips Mr. William, merchant,
Carmarthen
Philips Mr. Rich. Carmarthen
Phillips Messrs. Manchester, 2
copies
Phillips —, esq; Manchester
Phipson Mr. Wm. Birmingham
Phipson Mr. John, Birmingham
Pilkington Mr. Henry, Derby
Pinkerton Rev. John, Limerick
Pickburne Rev. J. Hackney
Piper Rev. H. H. Norton
Pittard Mr. R. East Lambrook
Platts Rev. J. Boston, 3 copies
Porter Mr. B. C. Sherborne
Potter Arthur, esq; Cockey Moor
Price Mr. Portsmouth
Price Mr. W. Gloucester
Priestley Joseph, esq; Tividale,
near Dudley
Priestnall Mr. Jas. Chorley
Prime Miss Elizabeth, Whitton,
Middlesex
Prime Miss Susannah, Whilton
Procter Rev. W. T. Wilmslow
Pyke Jas. esq; Bridgwater
Pyke T. jun. esq; Bridgwater

Ralph Mrs. Halifax
Ray Mr. John, Brookshaw, Bury
Read Mr. Thomas, Birmingham

Read Mr. Sam. *Gospel Oak*
 Read T. esq; *Poole*
 Rees Abraham, D. D. *London*
 Rees Rev. T. *London*, 2 copies
 Rees Mr. Evan, merchant, *Cardiff*
 Reid Matthew, esq; *Leicester*
 Reid Mr. Samuel, *Liverpool*
 Relph Mrs. *Walthamstow*
 Relph Mr. Cuthbert
 Reynell Mr. Henry, *Bristol*
 Rhodes Mr. Ebenezer, *Sheffield*
 Rhodes John, esq; *Halifax*
 Richardson Rev. W. *Lynn*
 Richards Rev. D. *South-Petherton*
 Richards Mr. T. *Birmingham*
 Richards Mr. W. *Birmingham*
 Ridout Mr. Jer. *Birmingham*
 Robberds Rev. J. G. *Manchester*
 Roberts Rev. Griff. *Warminster*
 Roberts Mr. *Lincoln*
 Robinson Thos. esq; *Manchester*
 Robinson Mr. Thos. jun. *Manchester*
 Robinson Mr. T. *Bury-St.-Edmund's*
 Rogers Mr. Sam. *Birmingham*
 Rogers Mrs. Mary, *Birmingham*
 Rotheram Mrs. *Kendal*
 Rotheram Mr. solicitor, *Thread-needle-street, London*
 Ronald Mr. Hugh, jun. *Brentford*
 Rowe Rev. John, *Bristol*
 Rowe Laurence, esq; *Brentford*
 Rowland Mr. John, bank, *Neath*
 Rowland Mr. John, *Boston*
 Rutt J. T. esq; *Bromley*
 Ryland Mr. Sam. *Birmingham*

Ryland Mr. Thos. *Birmingham*
 Ryland Mr. Jn. jun. *Birmingham*
 Ryland Mr. Jas. *Kentish-Town*
 Sallows Mr. Robert, *Plymouth*
 Salter Mr. R. *Bolton*
 Sanders Mr. Mark, *Birmingham*
 Sanderfon Miss, *Chorley*
 Saunders Mr. attorney at law, *Plymouth*
 Saxton Mr. *Leicester*
 Saxton Mr. Thomas, *Lea Wood, Derbyshire*
 Scargill Rev. W. P. *Bury-St.-Edmund's*
 Scott Rev. James, *Cradley*, 2 copies
 Scott John, esq; *Stourbridge*
 Scott William, esq; *Stourbridge*
 Scott Rev. Russell, *Portsmouth* 2 copies
 Seaward Rev. R. *Poole*
 Sharp Thomas, esq; *Romsey*
 Sherwell Miss, *Topsham*
 Shore Samuel, esq; *Meersbrook*
 Shore Samuel, esq; *Norton*
 Shore Sidney, esq; *Norton*
 Shore William, esq; *Tapton*
 Shore William, jun. esq; *Tapton*
 Shore John, esq; *Sheffield*
 Shute Stephen, esq; *Collumpton*
 Silver Mr. T. T. *Woodbridge*
 Simpson Rev. John, *Bath*
 Simpson J. W. esq; *Rearby* 2 copies
 Simpson Mr. John, *Birmingham*
 Skey George, esq; *Highbury*
 Skirrow Miss, *Southwark*

- Slatter Mr. *Ilminster*
 Slatter Mr. Thomas, *Ilminster*
 Slatter Mr. William, *Ilminster*
 Sleat R. W. esq; *Christchurch*
 Small Rev. J. *Coseley*
 Small Mr. Thos. *Birmingham*
 Small Mr. Thomas, *Boston*
 Smith Thomas, esq; *Easton-Grey*
 Smith Mrs. *Easton-Grey*
 Smith Mrs. Martha, *Coventry*
 Smith Mr. Edward, *Birmingham*
 Smith Mr. Timothy, *Birmingham*
 Smith Mr. Samuel, *Birmingham*
 Smith Mr. Robert, *Glasgow*
 Smith Mrs. T. C. *Nottingham*
 Smith W. esq; M. P. *Westminster*
 Smith Mr. *Quorn*
 Smith Mrs. W. Hawkes, *Birmingham*
 Smith Mr. G. *Hinckley*
 Society, New Reading, *Hackney*
 Solomon Abraham, M. D. *Birmingham*
 Sparkes Samuel, esq; *Crewkerne*
 Sparkes Isaac, esq; *Crewkerne*
 Spicer John, esq; *Christchurch*
 Spurr Mr. Peter, *Sheffield*
 Staniforth Mr. W. *Sheffield*
 Stanley Mr. John, *Stockport*
 Steward Rev. J. *Wolverhampton*
 Stewart Mr. W. *Birmingham*
 Stokes Mr. *Wolverhampton*
 Stone Mr. Harry, *Taunton*
 Stone Mr. *Nottingham*
 Stone S. esq; *Knighton*
 Stone J. P. esq; *Quorn*
 Stone T. esq; *Barrow*
 Stone Mr. Joseph, *Bridport*
 Stout Miss, *Plymouth*
 Strong Mr. S. S. *Poole*
 Strutt Mr. William, *Derby*
 Strutt Mr. Joseph, *Derby*
 Stuckey Vincent, esq; *Langport*
 Sudbury Mr. *Gainsborough*
 Surridge Mr. Rich. *Norhampton*
 Sweet Mr. J. L. *Glasgow*
 Symonds Mrs. *Taunton*
 Talbot Mr. G. *Kidderminster*
 Talbot Mr. Henry, *Kidderminster*
 Tankersley Mr. *Gainsborough*
 Tayler Rev. James, *Nottingham*
 Tayler Mr. Wager, *Nottingham*
 Tayleur Charles, esq; *Liverpool*
 Taylor Rev. Philip, *Dublin*
 Taylor Mr. John Lyon, *Rochdale*
 Temple R. G. esq; *Roehampton*
 Thomas Mr. Thos. *Plymouth-Dock*
 Thomas Mr. solicitor, *Carmarthen*, 2 copies
 Thompson Mr. *Cross-lane, St. Mary hill, London*
 Thompson Mr. P. *Boston*
 Thompson Wm. esq; *Sheffield*
 Thomson John, M. D. *Halifax*
 Thornley Mr. *Liverpool*
 Tingcombe John, esq; *Plymouth*
 Tinckler Mr., *Boston*
 Titford Mr. W. *Hoxton*
 Todhunter Mr. J. *Walthamstow*
 Todhunter Mr. *Walthamstow*
 Toller Rich. esq; *South-Petherton*
 Tomkin Mr. Henry, *Plymouth*
 Toms Rev. S. S. *Framlingham*
 Tonken Mr. H. *Plymouth-Dock*

- Toogood Rev. Chas. *Broadway*
 Toogood Wm. esq; *Sherborne*
 Toogood Mr. Jas. *Sherborne*
 Toogood Rev. John, *Kinton-Magna, Dorset*
 Touchet Mr. *Manchester*, 2 copies
 Touchet Mr. John, *Manchester*
 Touchet Mr. Jas. *Manchester*
 Toulmin Mr. J. B. *Birmingham*
 Toulmin Mrs. J. B. *Birmingham*
 Travers A. esq; *Shirley Common near Southampton*
 Travers Mr. Benj. *near Southampton*
 Treacher John, esq, *Bruton Crescent*
 Treffry Roger, esq; *Lostwithiel*
 Treffry Mr. Jos. *Plymouth*
 Treleaven Rev. B. *Dorchester*
 Treleaven Mr. John, *Plymouth*
 Turner Rev. W. *Newcastle-on Tyne*
 Turner Rev. W. jun. M. A. *York*
 Turner Rev. Henry, *Bradford*
 Unitarian Tract Society, *Falmouth*
 Upham Mr. bookseller, *Bath*, 3 copies
 Venning Miss, *Nottingham*
 Venning Mrs. W. *Nottingham*
 Wainwright Rev. Thos. *Whitton, Middlesex*, 2 copies
 Wainwright Robert, esq; *Gray's Inn*, 6 copies
 Waldron Jas. esq; *Wiveliscombe*
 Waldrop John, esq; *Poole*
 Walker Mr. Wm. *Rochdale*
 Walker Mr. Rich. *Bridge-hall, Bury*
 Wallace Mr. Robt. *York College*
 Walker Dr. *Portsmouth*
 Waller Mr. *Gosport*
 Wallington Mr. *Ilminster*
 Wallington Mr. Tim. *Ilminster*
 Wansey Mrs. W. *Warminster*, 2 copies
 Wansey Henry, jun. esq; *Warminster*
 Wansey Mr. Wm. *Clapham*
 Ward T. A. esq; *Sheffield*
 Warren John, esq; *Taunton*
 Warren Peter, esq; *Warminster*
 Warren Rev. Mr. *Wymondley Academy*
 Washbourn Mrs. *Glocester*
 Washbourn Mrs. Eliza, *Glocester*
 Washbourn Mr. J. *Glocester*
 Waterhouse Mr. T. *Birmingham*
 Watson Mr. Jacob, *Bridgwater*
 Watson Mr. Rich. *Kidderminster*
 Wearne Mr. Roger, *St. Ives*
 Wellbeloved Rev. C. *York*
 Welsford P. esq; *Plymouth*
 Westlake Mr. John, *Moretonhampstead*
 Weston Mr. Jas. *Sherborne*
 Whetstone Mr. *Leicester*
 Whetstone Mr. Jas. *Dudley*
 Whitchurch Mr. *Bath*
 White James, esq; *Exeter*
 White Mr. *Basford, near Nottingham*
 White Henry, esq; *Portsmouth*
 White Mr. Edw. *Moretonhampstead*

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Whitfield Mr. Sam. <i>Birmingham</i> | Worthington Mr. T. <i>Leicester</i> |
| Whitfield Mr. Edw. <i>Birmingham</i> | Worthington Mr. W. <i>Stockport</i> |
| Whitty Mr. <i>Sherborne</i> | Wright Rev. R. <i>Widbeach</i> |
| Wickstead John, esq; <i>Shrews-</i> | Wright Mr. F. B. <i>Liverpool</i> |
| bury, 3 copies | Wright Mr. Dan. <i>Birmingham</i> |
| Wilmot Mr. <i>Birmingham</i> | Wright Mr. Chas. <i>Boston</i> |
| Williams —, esq; <i>Plymouth</i> | Wright Rev. Peter, <i>Rochdale</i> |
| Williams Mr. Taliesin, <i>Neath</i> | Wright Mr. Thos. <i>Derby</i> |
| Wills Mr. Robt. <i>Poole</i> | Wyne Mr. <i>Plymouth</i> |
| Wills Mr. James, <i>Birmingham</i> | |
| Willson Mr. Nath. <i>Northampton</i> | Yates Rev. John, <i>Liverpool</i> |
| Witton P. H. esq; <i>Birmingham</i> , | Yates Rev. Jas. M. A. <i>Glasgow</i> |
| 2 copies | Yates Mr. John Ashton, <i>Liver-</i> |
| Wood G. W. esq; <i>Manchester</i> | pool |
| Wood Mr. Ottiwell, <i>Liverpool</i> | Yates Mr. Rich. V. <i>Liverpool</i> |
| Wood Mr. John, <i>Liverpool</i> | Yates Mr. Pemberton H. <i>Liver-</i> |
| Wood G. esq; <i>Manchester</i> | pool |
| Wood Mr. Thos. Jackson, <i>Bury</i> | Yates Mr. Rob. <i>Ardwick Green,</i> |
| Wood Mr. Ab. jun. <i>Bury</i> | <i>Manchester</i> |
| Woodcock Mr. J. surgeon, <i>Bury</i> | Youle Mr. <i>Gainsborough</i> |
| Woolley Mrs. <i>Nottingham</i> | Young Mr. Spence, <i>Poole</i> |

PREFACE.

WHEN the Author of this work published his edition of Neal's "History of the Puritans," he expressed his intention to prepare à sequel to it, exhibiting a continuation of the history of *Protestant Dissenters* from the *Revolution* to our own day, in such detached parts as would correspond to the periods, into which, in his judgment, it would naturally divide itself. Not only was the design which he announced approved of, but earnest wishes for its execution were expressed, as well by esteemed and partial friends, as by a general sentiment on its importance and utility, and of his qualifications for it. These testimonies of public as well as private opinion in its favour were, undoubtedly, a stimulus and encouragement to the prosecution of his purpose, and justified an expectation that long ere now he would have endeavoured to fulfil wishes so honourable to himself and to his design with gladness and alacrity.

It gives the author concern to reflect that eighteen years have elapsed without affording a proof, by

the execution of any part of his intended work; that he was sensible either of the deference which he owed to public expectation, and to the desires of warm friends, or of the obligation brought on him by his own engagement. Some, who took a great interest in his design, are, in the mean time, removed from this world, which daily furnishes us with so many instances of disappointed hopes, and of purposes broken off by death. His heart feels the heaving sigh at the recollection of the remonstrances on his delay of two much-respected friends in particular: one, the Rev. *Josiah Thompson*, of *Clapham*, who again and again testified a solicitude for the appearance of this history before his days were numbered; the other, the late worthy and active friend to the cause of religious liberty, the Rev. *Samuel Palmer*, to whose pen and labours in various ways *dissenters* owe permanent obligations. But vain are the sighs of affection and friendship over the grave of lost friends: vain are our regrets that we have failed to answer the wishes of the esteemed and the loved, now no more!

The author consoles himself with believing that they who know him will candidly acquit him of any disrespect to the deceased, or of desultory idleness. His attention, he may be permitted to plead, has been for years diverted from this work by a succession of occurrences and engagements which, unforeseen

when it was announced, have either accompanied or followed the anguish of mourning, or the depressions of deep sorrow on the death of children who had just reached the promising years of maturity ; especially of a daughter, whose removal was so circumstanced as to create, by a lasting mournful sense of it, a long interval of inaptitude for any continued mental exertion. This afflicting event was succeeded, at different distances, not only by other similar trials, but by avocations that arose from the confidence and trust reposed in him by several deceased friends ; by derangement of studies produced by removals from one dwelling to another ; and above all by the reading and application to prepare an extensive Course of Lectures for young persons, in which his present pastoral connection engaged him more than ten years ago.

But an apology may be becoming him for this detail of the obstructions that have impeded the accomplishment and progress of his present work. Let that apology be the author's reasonable and humble wish to stand justified in the opinion of his friends, and to exculpate himself from imputations that may be discreditable to him.

The first part of his "History" at length offers itself to the perusal of those who may feel an interest in its design ; and submits itself to their candour with timidity and diffidence ; in union, however, with the hope which past experience of indulgence and approbation inspires. Whatever imperfections or

faults may be discovered in it, he trusts that it will not be open to censure on the ground of misrepresentation, or the illiberality of a party spirit, or of airs of infallibility.

The usefulness of such a work, as it collects into one narrative the documents of past events ere they are lost, and recalls the transactions of past times before the remembrance of them is quite obliterated, encourages the author to hope, will give his history an interest with many readers in general; and its particular reference he would promise himself will excite the attention of Dissenters from our national establishment, of every sect.

His modest expectations are justified by the consideration that the Revolution under William III. introduced a new order of things in the ecclesiastical state of this country, and a new æra in the history of the dissenters from our establishment. The affairs of this large body of protestants have since that time worn a new aspect; new questions in theology have been brought into discussion: new sects have sprung up: and under the different succeeding reigns new attempts have been made to extend the blessing of religious liberty, and establish it on a firmer basis. These events are not only such as dissenters must feel a concern in, but they are connected with the history of the human mind, of the fluctuations of opinions, and of the progress of religious truth and of national felicity.

The author has endeavoured to execute his design on a comprehensive plan; which includes the History of the Dissenters, first, as blended with the political occurrences of the times and the measures of government; then as united with the subjects above-mentioned, and as connected with the origin of institutions for the diffusion of religious knowledge and of academical foundations, with a review of theological literature, and with biographical sketches.

At the advanced years to which the indulgent Providence of God hath lengthened out the life of the author, it becomes him to form purposes for future time with serious and moderate apprehensions on the continuance of life and vigour. But yet he may be allowed, with a resignation to the disposals of unerring *Divine Wisdom*, to signify his intentions, if this volume meet with the approbation of the candid and judicious, to proceed with all convenient speed in the execution of his plan; and to extend the next volume to the accession of his present Majesty.

In connection with the publication of such a work a wish may properly be expressed, that readers in general would take into consideration the utility and importance of ecclesiastical history, particularly that of their own country and sect, to the rising generation; whose minds are open to permanent impressions from the historic form of instruction, as it meets curiosity, displays the progress of rational enquiry,

and the triumphs of truth over ignorance and superstition, enlarges the views of men and things, informs the understanding, and affects the heart.

It would invite youth to read, if, besides the larger works which stand on the shelves of a library, there were always lying on the table in the parlour some such historical treatises, as the Abridgement of Burnet's History of the Reformation in England, and of Brandt's in the Low Countries; Chandler's History of Persecution; and a smaller piece than either of these works, entitled "A Brief and Impartial History of the Puritans," 12mo. printed for Longman and Co. by the author's old and highly esteemed friend, the Rev. Joseph Cornish; mentioned in the advertisement to the last volume of his edition of Neal, but which has not, it is understood, met with the attention and sale its merit and nature promised.

The youth of the present day grow up at a great distance of time from the transactions and events, under the immediate and lively impressions of which their ancestors were formed to support, with enlightened minds and consistent firmness, the character of *Protestant Dissenters* and *Advocates of Religious Liberty*. Those events seldom, in these times, become the topics even of domestic and paternal conversation. It is therefore of great importance, that books should offer to them the entertainment and information of the historic page.

To this explanation of the nature; plan, and utility of his work, the author has little to add, but his warm and very grateful acknowledgments for the strong marks of personal respect, and of confidence in his execution of it, which the list of subscribers, numerous beyond his most sanguine expectations, affords him. He felt a reluctance to the mode of publication, which, at the importunity of some particular friends, he adopted. He is gratified with the event, which has sanctioned their opinion of the countenance with which his proposals would be favoured; and with the testimonies of cordial esteem and regard which he could not presume to flatter himself he should receive. He feels the friendship and honour shewn to him; and hopes that his expressions of respect and gratitude will be fully accredited. He is particularly sensible of the ardour and activity with which some particular friends have circulated his prospectus: among instances of this it becomes him to notice the concern for its reception felt by his respectable colleague, and the peculiar interest taken in the circulation of it, and the assistance afforded to him, by his much-esteemed friend, the Rev. *James Hewes Bransby*, of Dudley.

Birmingham, Bath-row, 3d June, 1814.

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY

JOHN BURNET

OF

SCOTLAND

AND

OF

THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE SECOND

BY

JOHN BURNET

OF

SCOTLAND

AND

OF

THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE SECOND

THE CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

GENERAL REFLECTIONS on the **ACT of TOLERATION**, the causes from which it originated, and its operation. The state of the Dissenters, and their different Denominations. P. 1—4.

CHAPTER I.

THE GENERAL HISTORY.

WILLIAM's (Prince of *Orange*) accession to the throne. The promising aspect of the times. Rise of new animosities. Conduct of the dissenters. Bill of comprehension brought into parliament; the case of the dissenters stated by Mr. *Howe*; had the sanction of the king from the throne. The fate of an attempt in the House of Lords to relieve the dissenters from the obligation to receive the sacrament at church. A modification of the test-laws proposed; but rejected. A bill for uniting his Majesty's subjects brought into the House, and lost. The protest of the lords. The fate of the bill in the house of Commons. A party formed against the government, ini-

mical to the bill. A conversation on the state of times in the presence of Sir *John Reresby*. Act of Toleration passed : its good effects and its defects : the satisfaction and dissatisfaction it created. A scheme of union to be laid before the Convocation proposed. A commission to ten bishops and twenty divines to prepare it, issued out by the king. A paper of concessions drawn up by Dr. *Tillotson*. The commission opened on the 10th October 1689 ; some of the commissioners decline acting. The proceedings of the other commissioners commenced under happy auspices, and pursued with temper and diligence : the points brought under review, and the alterations to be adopted : a family prayer-book proposed to be composed and authorised. Observations on their proceedings. Publications in favour of them by Dr. *Prideaux* and Bishop *Burnet*. The attention excited by this ecclesiastical commission. The arguments in its favour urged by advocates for it. The replies to them. The concessions made by some : the strong objections urged by others against it : and attempted to be obviated. The unyielding opposition of many to it. A tract entitled, "*Vox Cleri*," expressive of their sentiments. A cry raised by the adherents to the abdicated king. Great canvassing, particularly for the prolocutor of the lower house in the election of members of the Convocation. Meeting of the Convocation on the 21st of November 1689. The sermon preached by Dr. *Beveridge*. The prolocutor, Dr. *Jane*, presented for approbation, and addresses the assembly in a pointed Latin speech. The second meeting of the Convocation : a defect in the royal commission discovered : and the meeting prorogued. Both houses of Convocation convened, on the 4th of December, in Henry VIIIth's chapel : a message from the king : an address from the bishops to his Majesty : disapproved and rejected by the lower house of Convocation : a conference on behalf of each house, held by Bishop *Burnet* and the prolocutor : an

address in the issue agreed to by the upper house of Convocation only. The Convocation adjourned, and then dissolved with the Parliament. Bishop *Burnet's* remarks. The evil consequences of the disagreement between the two houses of Convocation. The collision of parties. The termination of this and six prior attempts to reform the church of England. The consequences of the miscarriage of the royal commission. Several books presented by the prolocutor, previously to the dissolution of the Convocation, as publications of dangerous consequences, viz. "Notes upon the Creed of Athanasius," and Dr. *Prideaux's* "Letter to a friend relating to the present Convocation."—The situation of the bishops and clergy, who had refused to take the oaths to the new government. The history of that business: and biographical sketches of the bishops implicated in it; particularly of Archbishop *Sancroft's* Remarks. Their sees, after a year, filled up. Bishop *Burnet's* reflection. The case of the inferior clergy who refused the oaths. A bill requiring the oaths to be taken by a fixed day. The operation of it, when passed into an act, especially on those who continued to refuse them; as Mr. *Henry Dodwell*, Dr. *George Hicks*, and Dr. *William Sherlock*. The difference of principle among those who took the oaths: the subsequent conduct of those who were dissatisfied with them: the contest, to which this state of parties gave birth; and the inversion of opinion and argument on the power of the magistrate, and on the principle of passive obedience, which arose from it. The dissenting ministers called on to claim the protection of the Act of Toleration by subscription to the doctrinal articles of the church of England: Mr. *Baxter's* statement of his ideas on the meaning of some of them. The dissenters direct their attention to their own internal state. The leading sects amongst them: presbyterians and independents. A coalition of these two parties proposed. The heads of agreement stated and reviewed: the pre-

preliminaries settled: the coalition commenced: a defect in the plan. Contentions in the church. Conduct of Dr. *George Hicks*. The indulgence shewn to the deprived clergy. Tracts, entitled, "A vindication of the deprived Bishops:" and "Solomon and Abiathar; or the case of the deprived Bishops." An attempt to raise a schism in the church. The death of Archbishop *Tillotson*. Dr. *Tennison* nominated to the see of Canterbury, and first act after his advancement. The death of Queen *Mary*. Publications on this event. A conspiracy to assassinate the king: the execution of the conspirators. The dissenters exposed to new hardships. Proceedings commenced against Dr. *Oldfield*, and Mr. *Frankland*, for keeping academical seminaries. The conduct of Sir *Humphrey Edwin*, in carrying the regalia of his office to a meeting-house, and the offence taken at it. The statute against blasphemy and profaneness. Its origin, provisions, prohibitions, and penalties. Reflections on it. Proceedings against the papists, and a bill of great severity brought into the house. The spirit and policy from which it proceeded. The recent repeal of it. The death of King *William*.

Page 1 to 133.

CHAPTER II.

Controversies agitated in the period between the
 REVOLUTION and the death of King WILLIAM.

SECTION I.

The Controversy respecting the Rights, Powers,
 and Privileges of Convocations.

The Convocation, its nature and origin. Discontents on the suspension of its meetings. A Convocation called on February 10th, 1700. Dr. *Hooper* chosen prolocutor. Archbishop *Tennison*'s attempt to prorogue it: resisted by

the lower house: the proceedings to which this resistance gave rise. The lower house censure, as erroneous, *Toland's* "Christianity not Mystical," and Bishop *Burnet's* "Explanation of the Articles." The bishops demur on these measures, particularly with respect to Bishop *Burnet's* work; their final decision. The altercations between the two houses continued. The Convocation prorogued. A new Convocation summoned. An address to the king. New disputes arise, particularly on the right of adjournment. The session prorogued to the 14th of February, and then to the 5th of March. A complaint lodged against Bishop *Burnet* by the prolocutor, Dr. *Woodward*. The session closed with a conciliatory speech by the archbishop. The effect of it. The Convocation dissolved by the king's death. A new question started, and a new clamour excited. The noise attracted by the disputes of the two houses of Convocation. The field of controversy which they opened. The writers who distinguished themselves on this occasion, and the publications that appeared. Bishop *Warburton's* remarks on this controversy. P. 134—172.

SECTION II.

The Trinitarian Controversy.

The publications of Dr. *Wallis*, Mr. *Biddle*, Dr. *Sherlock*, and Dr. *Cudworth*, on the doctrine of the Trinity. The vote of the House of Commons on a tract entitled "A clear but brief Confutation of the Doctrine of the Trinity," in 1693. Dr. *South's* animadversions on Dr. *Sherlock's* treatise. Mr. *Howe's* sentiments concerning the Trinity; and his tract. Dr. *Sherlock's* and Dr. *South's* sentiments respectively espoused by some and impugned by others. Mr. *Bingham's* sermon in favour of the former. The decree of the university of Oxford. The king's injunctions on the

occasion: a remark on it. Proceedings against Mr. *John Smith* for a tract entitled "The designed end to the Socinian Controversy." Dr. *Bury* excommunicated. Dr. *Sherlock* and Dr. *South* ridiculed in a popular ballad. P. 172—187.

SECTION III.

The Controversy about Justification.

Divisions and dissensions amongst the dissenters. The cause from which they arose. Mr. *Davis*, of Rothwell, broaches opinions, and introduces practices, that incurred censure. A declaration published against them: the effect of it. The controversy on the doctrine of justification agitated in the time of the civil wars. The attention of Mr. afterwards Bishop *Bull* drawn to it. His *Harmonia Apostolica*. This work prohibited by Dr. *Morley*, bishop of Winchester; animadverted on by Dr. *Barlow*, Dr. *Tully*, and by Mr. *Truman*, Mr. *Tombes*, Mr. *Gataker*, Mr. *Du Moulin*. The controversy terminated in the established church; taken up by the dissenters. Mr. *Baxter*'s "Aphorisms of Justification" and the Covenant: answered by different writers. Dr. *Crisp*'s scheme. The controversy about justification revived by the republication of his works in 1690: the flame spreads through several counties: and the ferment rises high. Dr. *Williams* solicited to confute Dr. *Crisp*'s principles: his "Gospel Truths" stated and vindicated. Dr. *Chauncy* animadverted on it. Mr. *Mather*'s sermon on justification. A rupture between the lecturers at Pinners' Hall. An appeal on this controversy made to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, bishop of Worcester, and to Dr. *Jonathan Edwards*. Dr. *Williams* excluded from the lecture at Pinners' Hall: a new lecture set up at Salters' Hall. Conciliating proposals inefficient. Dr. *Williams*'s character traduced, but cleared up. The two denominations of presbyterians and independents become distinct communities. P. 187—214.

CHAPTER III.

Internal History of the Protestant Dissenters.

SECTION I.

Of their Academies.

The origin of them. The jealousy they created. Harassing processes commenced against them. The oath on taking a degree in the universities, the ground of these processes. The occasion of that oath. The Stamford seminary. The different constructions of the academic oath. The principles on which the ejected ministers considered themselves as not included in the obligation of the oath. P. 215—225.

Particular Seminaries.

No. 1. Mr. *Woodhouse's* academy. His plan of instruction, and course of lectures. No. 2. Mr. *Warren's* method of reading lectures. No. 3. Mr. *Chas. Morton's* general method, his *Eutaxia*, or lectures on the English constitution; and his emigration to America. No. 4. Mr. *Richard Frankland's* talents and dispositions as a tutor, the frequent removals of his seminary, and the numbers educated in it. No. 5. Mr. *Doolittle's* academy. No. 6. Mr. *John Shuttlewood's* reputation as a tutor: inscription on his tombstone. No. 7. Mr. *Sam. Cradock's* lectures and liberal conduct to his pupils. P. 225—241.

Slight sketches of the history of other divines who assisted the studies of young men, viz. Mr. *Edward Veal*, London; Mr. *Philip Henry*, Shropshire; Dr. *Theophilus Gale*, at Newington Green; Dr. *Henry Langley*, near Abingdon; Mr. *John Malden*, near Whitchurch, Shropshire; Mr. *Obadiah Grew*, Coventry; Mr. *Thomas Shewell*, in that city; Dr. *Joshua Oldfield*, Coventry and London; Mr. *Henry New-*

come, Manchester; Mr. *James Coningham*, in the same town; Mr. *Ralph Button*, Brentford; Mr. *Wm. Wickens*, Newington Green; Mr. *Benj. Robinson*, Hungerford; Mr. *Henry Hickman*, near Stourbridge, Worcestershire; an account of Mr. *John Ball*, of Honiton, Devon, one of his pupils: history of Mr. *Thos. Cotton*, another pupil of Mr. *Hickman*; his travels and character. General reflection. P. 241—261.

SECTION II.

The different Sects of Dissenters at the Revolution.

The name *Puritans*. The denominations of Presbyterians. Independents, Baptists, and Quakers. P. 261—263.

§. 1. Of the *Presbyterians*. Their sentiments on church government: the first presbytery: the spread of their principles, and the establishment of this sect under the authority of Parliament: presbytery abolished after the Restoration: the intolerance of the presbyterian hierarchy while it existed, and the powers exercised by it: the manner of ordination as practised by it: the requisition to take the solemn league and covenant: the tenor of the testimonials given at ordinations: the rise of a new class of ministers in this period: and the controversy on the validity of presbyterian ordination, to which it gave rise. P. 263—279.

§. 2. Of the *Independents*. The fundamental principle of this sect: their churches denominated *congregational*, in distinction from *parochial*: the origin of this sect, and first church: their increase during the protectorate of *Cromwell*: a synod holden by them: the constitution of their churches friendly to the exercise of private judgment. P. 279—286.

§. 3. Of the *Baptists*. Their first formation into a separate society: a general assembly holden by them in 1689: a fund raised for the support of a regular minister: the questions debated, at this assembly: the caution of their address to

James II. on his "Declaration of Liberty of Conscience:" a summary of their faith and practice agreed on: the manner in which the business of the assembly was conducted. Another general assembly holden in 1691. A short confession of faith published: a review of some of its articles. A third general assembly convened at London: the transactions of it: a controversy concerning vocal music in public worship: the determination of the assembly on it: an address to King *William* on the discovery of the assassination plot: a charge of denying both the divinity and humanity of Christ brought against Mr. *Matthew Caffin*: Mr. *Caffin's* defence of himself, and the determination of the assembly: the affair resumed and settled at a subsequent assembly in the county of Northampton. Public disputations holden at different times and at different places, particularly one at Portsmouth under his Majesty's licence, between the baptists and pædobaptists. Mr. *Pilkington's* history and renunciation of popery: the address of the baptists on the death of *James II.* Different denominations of baptists, viz. *particular* and *general*: a peculiar office, that of messengers, among them. P. 286-328.

Biographical memoirs of eminent characters amongst the baptists. Mr. *Wm. Kiffin*. Mr. *Thomas Patient*. Mr. *John Bunyan*, his education, conversion, poverty, preaching, sufferings, and imprisonment; his enlargement, his labours, death, character, and works, particularly the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Mr. *Isaac Lamb*. Mr. *Thomas Grantham*. Mr. *James Marham*. Mr. *Edward Morecock*. Mr. *John Miller*. Mr. *George Hammon*, and others. P. 328—369.

§. 4. Of the *Quakers*. Instances in which the Act of Toleration was modelled to meet the scruples of this party of dissenters, and to afford them relief. An instance which marked a rigorous spirit towards them. Their sufferings. An Act of Parliament to admit their solemn affirmation instead of an oath passed. A clause relative to the exactment

of tithes introduced. A bill brought into the House of Lords to enforce the better payment of small tithes and other church dues, opposed and laid aside. The address of the Society of Friends after the peace of Rylwick in 1697. The spirit of persecution breaks out, and a petition against them prepared to be presented to the House of Commons, but discountenanced. An address from the Society of Friends on the death of James II. P. 369—388.

Memoirs of some distinguished characters who appeared in this community: namely, Mr. *Alexander Parker*, Mr. *Robert Lodge*, Mr. *Thomas Salthouse*, Mr. *Chas. Marshall*, Mr. *John Crook*, Mr. *Robert Barclay*, and Mr. *George Fox*. P. 388—414.

CHAPTER IV.

New Charitable Institutions.

Associations for instruction and devotion. The origin of the societies for the reformation of manners: their progress and effects: their distribution of books. The murder of Mr. *Cooper* and Mr. *Dent*. The rise of the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge," and of "Charity Schools." The dispersion of bibles, common-prayer books, and tracts. *Voltaire's* method of enlightening the world, and Count *Struensee's* remark upon it. The history of the first charity school opened by protestant dissenters. The abuse made of the charity schools in the established church, from disaffection to the government: the offence taken at it. The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge extend their views to other countries, and enlarge their plan by the distribution of books in foreign languages, and by the establishment of schools and missions. Origin of the "Society for the propagation of the Gospel in New England and the parts adjacent in America," in 1646; and the new establishments given to it by *Charles II.* and

King *William*. The objects of it. Mr. *Boyle's* lecture. A general view of the sermons preached at it, and published under the patronage of the trustees of the institution. An account of the Rev. Dr. *Thomas Bray*, and his benevolent exertions. P. 415—447.

CHAPTER V.

A Concise Review of Theological Publications.

A Spirit of Enquiry, its operation. Tracts published on occasion of the Revolution. *Locke's* "First Letter on Toleration;" the various editions of it, its principle and effects. "A Letter to a Member of Parliament on the liberty of the Press," and other Tracts on the same subject, by Dr. *Tyndal* and Mr. *Charles Blount*. *Milton's* "Areopagitica." *Clifford's* "Treatise on Human Reason." "An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, within the first three centuries." Mr. *Clarkson's* Treatises. Dr. *Thomas Burnet's* "Archæologiæ Philosophicæ; i. e. An Enquiry into the Doctrine of the antient Philosophers concerning the Original of the World," reviewed. Sir *Norton Knatchbull's* "Annotations upon some difficult Texts in all the books of the New Testament." Mr. *Tong's* "Vindication of Nonconformity." An Anonymous Publication of a candid and liberal Churchman, entitled "A Plea for Abatement in matters of Conformity to several Injunctions and Orders of the Church of England." By *Irenæus Junior* a conforming Member of the Church of England," 4to. Writers against Revelation; Lord *Herbert*, of Cherbury; Mr. *Thomas Hobbes*; Mr. *Charles Blount*; "The Oracles of Reason;" the Answers to it.—

Dr. *William King's* "Discourse concerning the Inventions of men in the Worship of God." Mr. *Boysse's* "Remarks on it." Mr. *James Owen's* Plea for Scripture "Ordination." Mr. *Locke's* "Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures;" a Review of it; the alarm it created; Answers to it; the Author's Vindication of it. Mr. *Bold's* defence of it. Bishop *Burnet's* "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. The History of it; attacked by Dr. *Binsley* and Dr. *Edwards*. P. 448—504.

CHAPTER VI.

Biographical Sketches of Eminent Characters and Writers.

Dr. *Obadiah Grew*. Dr. *John Collins*. Mr. *John Faldo*. Mr. *John Flavel*. Mr. *Richard Baxter*. Mr. *Thomas Rosewell*; the Prosecution of him; Judge *Jessie's* behaviour on the trial; the issue of it. The sentiments of the Right Hon. *Charles James Fox*. Mr. *Rosewell's* subsequent history, and death. The liberal conduct of two Clergymen. Mr. *Richard Steel*. Mr. *Thomas Gilbert*. Mr. *Robert Billio*. Mr. *Richard Mayo*. Mr. *Henry Newcome*. Dr. *Samuel Annesly*. Mr. *Philip Henry*. Mr. *Nathaniel Vincent*. Mr. *Thomas Cole*. Mr. *Matthew Barker*. Dr. *William Bates*. Mr. *Matthew Mead*. P. 505—529.

APPENDIX.

Number I. "The Case of the Protestant Dissenters represented and argued by Mr. *John Howe*. P. 531—542.
Number II. "An Abstract of the Reasons for and against the Bill of Union." P. 542—549.

Number III. "Heads of Agreement assented to by
 "the United Ministers in and about London, formerly
 "called Presbyterian and Congregational; not as a measure
 "for any national Constitution, but for the Preservation of
 "Order in our Congregations, that can not come up to the
 "common rule by law established. P. 549—556.

Number IV. "Dissenters Address on the Death of
 "Queen Mary."

Number V. "Lists of Students educated in the different
 "Seminaries, of which an account has been given," from
 p. 225 to p. 261.

I. Mr. *Woodhouse's* Pupils, - p. 559—567.

II. Mr. *Warren's*, - - - p. 567—570.

III. Mr. *Charles Moreton's*, - - p. 573—574.

IV. Mr. *Frankland's* - - - p. 575.

V. Mr. *Doalittle's* - - - p. 584.

CONTENTS OF THE NOTES.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE 23, Instance of a Prosecution for non-attending
 divine worship: the case of Mr. *Banger*. P. 27,
 the name of the Commissioners for a revival of the liturgy,
 the forms of divine worship and the book of canons. P.
 32—33, Dr. *Aldrich* and Dr. *Jane*; sketches of the bio-
 graphy of them. P. 35, the original copy of the review
 of the liturgy lodged with Dr. *Tennison*. P. 39, Family
 Prayer, the cause of its disuse, and the remedy provided
 for this decay of devotion. P. 50, "Vox Cleri," and the
 answers to it. P. 56, Bishop *Warburton's* remark on the
 answer of the English barons, "Nolumus leges Angliæ

“mutari.” P. 61, Archbishop *Blackburne*’s remark on the lower house of Convocation, and their notion of religion. P. 63, Dr. *Furneaux*’s censure of the Convocation. P. 73, Dr. *Kenn*, anecdotes of. P. 75, William *Penn*’s character vindicated from a misrepresentation of it by Bishop *Burnet*. P. 191, Mr. *Locke*’s definition of a church.

CHAPTER II.

Section 1. The Act of submission in the 25th of Henry VIII. p. 161. Dr. *Binckes*’s death.—Section 2, p. 179, Dr. *Watts*’s devotional declamation. P. 185, Ballad, called “The Battle Royal.”—Section 3. p. 196, Dr. *Moulin*’s candour and retraction. P. 204, Mr. *Orton*’s recommendation of Dr. *Williams*’s “Gospel Truth stated and vindicated.”

CHAPTER III.

Section 1. p. 219, the Oxford and Cambridge oaths. P. 230, Certificate of Mr. William *Woodhouse*’s ordination. P. 237, Mr. *Doolittle*’s meeting, the first built after the fire of London. P. 258, affecting instances of the dissolution of the churches of the Protestants in France.—Section 2. p. 333, the origin of Dissenters in the town of Bedford. P. 353, Mr. *Grantham Killingworth*’s character.

CHAPTER IV.

Page 440, Dr. *Bentley*’s great concern on account of his sermons at Mr. *Boyle*’s lecture.

CHAPTER V.

Page 463, Mr. *Clifford*’s “Treatise of Human Reason,” commended. P. 471, Liberality of the present times. P. 484, *Isaac Le Peyrere*’s Treatises, imprisonment, and recantation. P. 487, the *Biographiæ Britannicæ*, and *Goadby*’s British Biography, corrected.

CHAPTER VI.

Page 514. The Hon. Mr. *Charles James Fox*’s letter.

A HISTORY
OF THE
PROTESTANT DISSENTERS,
&c. &c.

*From the REVOLUTION to the Death of King
WILLIAM in 1702.*

INTRODUCTION.

THE ACT OF TOLERATION, with which the reign of King William and Queen Mary began, formed a new epoch in the Ecclesiastical History of Great-Britain. While we look back on the ages of superstition and spiritual tyranny, which preceded the Reformation; and survey, in later times, the contests occasioned by the new religious establishment which had its origin during the reign of Henry VIII. but was not brought to a permanent state till that of his daughter Queen Elizabeth; painful scenes of oppression on one side, and of sufferings on the other, pass before us. The successive reigns of the Stuarts had exhibited a series of penal statutes in religion and of severities, the object of which was to silence, if not to exterminate, those who protested

against the defects of the Reformation from Popery ; called in question any of the doctrines retained in the Protestant Creed ; or refused a compliance with the forms and ceremonial settled by Acts of Parliament. The Dissenters from the Church of England, as it was modelled in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who at their first origin obtained the name of PURITANS, enjoyed a short breathing from the severe assaults of persecution, during the existence of the Presbyterian form of Church Government, in the time of the Republic. They then bore the ecclesiastical keys ; but it was not a period of religious freedom and toleration. Authority in religion was usurped and exercised in their provincial assemblies ; and the commonwealth passed an ordinance for punishing blasphemies and heresies, than which no decree of any Council, no bull of any Pope, could be more dogmatical or authoritative ; few, if any, have been more sanguinary. The livings of the episcopal clergy were sequestered, and a severe ordinance was enacted against those who had been thus deprived. During the periods preceding the accession of the Prince of Orange to the throne of England, in which one persecuting measure had followed another ; tracts had been written, both by the Independents and the Quakers, (sects newly risen up,) in the cause of religious liberty, and in defence of the rights of conscience ; but the arguments in these publications, coming from the pens of the *oppressed*, not of those in power, neither produced a conviction, nor disseminated just ideas on the subject, so widely as to

have any general effect. The alarm and danger which the Church of England felt during the reign of King James II., arising in a great measure from his precipitate and violent attempts to introduce Popery, contributed much to prepare the way for the Act of Toleration; by disposing the Members and the Clergy of the Establishment to make a common cause with the Dissenters, as against a common enemy. "The Prince of Orange, in his own opinion, always thought, that conscience was God's province, and that it ought not to be imposed on: and his experience in Holland made him look on toleration as one of the wisest measures of government."* The necessities of the times demanded it; as a bond of union, as a termination of calamitous scenes, as a security to the new civil establishment, it became necessary. It reflected a glory on the æra to which it gave a date; and in the following history it will appear, that the most favourable consequences, an enlargement of toleration by new Acts of Legislature, freedom of enquiry, and the progress of knowledge, followed from it. After many years of religious contention, it was a general act of pacification. It put an end to the restraints, fines, imprisonments, and cruelties, which had harassed the conscientious. Though it was partial and limited, and left much to be done, yet it was a most valuable advantage gained to the interests of truth; and it gave to a numerous body of citizens a weight in the

* Burnet's "History of his own Times," vol. iv. p. 16. 12mo. Edinburgh.

political scale, which, though it was their birth-right, and highly beneficial to the community, the illiberality and injustice of former times and former reigns had denied them. Notwithstanding the oppressions suffered during those periods, the Dissenters had increased in numbers; and now consisted of several parties, who had not the same views on all points of religious enquiry and practice. They ranked under the different denominations of Independents, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers. With respect to the state, indeed, they generally formed but one body: each of these denominations, nevertheless, claims a particular and specific notice, and has its own history; they all participate in the national events and measures. The spirit of enquiry, to which the Act of Toleration gave existence, embraced various subjects that had not before fallen under investigation; and diffused its influence through the members of the Establishment itself. The human mind began vigorously to exert its native powers, and to range with delight through the wide field of religious knowledge. The facts which the following pages will detail, will illustrate and confirm this general statement.

CHAPTER I.

THE GENERAL HISTORY.

THE accession of William Prince of Orange to the English throne diffused joy through these nations, and all the neighbouring states and kingdoms. It relieved the fears of those who were ready to despair, as to the existence of the Protestant Religion and the liberties of Europe : and great hopes were entertained that the religious dissensions with which Great-Britain had been for many years distracted, would subside into harmony and peace. The Prince, in his declaration, published at the time of his expedition into England, promised his best efforts to promote a good agreement between the Church of England and all Protestant Dissenters ; and to protect and secure all those who would live peaceably under the government, from every kind of persecution upon the account of their religion. The

Dissenters, in their addresses to the throne,* expressed an ardent hope that their Majesties would, by their wisdom and authority, establish a firm union among their Protestant subjects in matters of religion ; and compose the differences between them, by making the rule of Christianity the rule of conformity. Though the government was invested in two royal personages, the Queen's dispositions and principles gave no reason to apprehend divided counsels. Previously to the Revolution, the bishops and clergy, with great unanimity, had acknowledged the necessity of widening the ecclesiastical foundation, and of forming a closer correspondence with the foreign Protestants. The behaviour of the Protestant Dissenters at that critical juncture, it was confessed, was so wise and generous, that it justly entitled them to the friendship of the Church ; which, unless it were " resolved to set all the world against it," as Bishop Burnet expresses himself, could not decline all the returns of ease and favour which were in its power.† It also augured well, that the Act of Toleration, exempting Dissenters from all penalties for not going to church, and for holding separate meetings, on condition of taking out warrants for the houses in which they assembled, and including an obligation on the justices to grant such warrants, passed easily. It was proposed by some, that this

* See my edition of Neal's " History of the Puritans," b. v. p. 78, 79, 80.

† Dr. Calamy's Abridgement of Baxter's Life, vol. ii. p. 427.

Act should be in force only for a limited time, as a temporary indulgence, that it might be an inducement with the Dissenters to demean themselves in a manner which would merit the renewal of it, when the stipulated term of years should expire; but this amendment was rejected, from observing the general disposition in favour of the Act, and from an apprehension that no future time might prove so favourable to its being enacted. The party of Christians called *Socinians* were excepted from the benefit of this Act: but it afforded protection to the Quakers; and indulged them with a permission to give security for their allegiance to government by a solemn declaration, in lieu of the oaths required from other dissenters.

In these respects the aspect of the times was promising; but darkness and clouds, portending future storms, soon gathered. New animosities arose; different sensations, both as to political and ecclesiastical matters, agitated the public mind. Some, since King James, to whom they had sworn allegiance, was still alive, scrupled taking the oaths to the new government. While many, from a wise and liberal design of strengthening the foundations of the new state of things, proposed alterations and amendments in the constitution, worship, and discipline of the Church: others strenuously opposed any change. These controversies were managed with great warmth and eagerness. The Dissenters, hoping that they should, in the issue, be no losers by such debates,

stood by, making their remarks. They were much encouraged in this hope, by observing, that in the recent disputes with the Papists, the Divines of the Established Church had been obliged to appeal to more correct and sound principles of Protestantism than they had before entertained; and had been led into more liberal views and more consistent sentiments.

When the succession to the throne, which James II's abdication had left vacant, was determined and settled, the spirit of animosity soon broke out again; and subsequent proceedings cut off all their hopes of a more perfect union with the Dissenters than was effected by the Act of Toleration. In 1689, Bills for a comprehension and an indulgence were brought into Parliament; both were canvassed; and many and warm debates took place in the Houses of Lords and Commons. Some, of confined and illiberal views, forgot their former declarations and promises, and argued for keeping the Dissenters under a bond: others expressed more generous dispositions, and were advocates for measures which would meet their scruples and conciliate their minds. But Burnet says, "that those who moved for the
" Bill of Comprehension, and afterwards brought it
" into the House, acted a very disingenuous part;
" for while they studied to recommend themselves
" by this shew of moderation, they urged their
" friends to oppose it; and those who gave it their
" cordial support, were represented as enemies to

“ the Church, and as actuated by a secret intention
“ to subvert it.*

At this juncture, Mr. Howe, who had been ejected by the Act of Uniformity, from the rectory of Great Torrington in Devonshire, published a sheet of paper, in which he fairly and candidly stated the case of the Dissenters, and with great ability and judgment pleaded their rights. His tract proceeded on this undoubted principle, that the Dissenters were under one common obligation, with the rest of mankind, by the universal law of nature, to worship God in public assemblies. His reasoning is then directed and applied to existing facts; namely, that things were annexed to the public worship of reformed Christianity in the Church of England, which, it was acknowledged, were neither necessary in themselves, nor parts of Christianity. As the Dissenters judged them to be in some part sinful, they could not with a good conscience conform to the public worship which the law enjoined; and yet the law strictly forbade their assembling to worship God otherwise. This was as if the Legislature should say, “ If you will not consent with us
“ in our superadded rites and modes against your
“ consciences, you shall not worship God; or if you
“ will not accept our additions to the Christian
“ religion, you shall not be Christians;” and manifestly tended to reduce a great part of a Christian nation to Paganism. On these premises, as the

* Burnet's “ History of his own Times,” vol. iv. p. 15. Edinb. edit. in 12mo.

Dissenters had been accustomed for many years, unless when restrained by violence, to hold distinct assemblies, and to worship God in a way which their consciences approved; Mr. Howe enquires, whether they are to be blamed for this conduct? Whether laws enjoining additions to our religion, acknowledged by all not to be essential and necessary, and deemed by many sinful, and thus becoming exclusive terms of communion, ought to have been passed? Whether such laws should be continued? especially when they were enacted by a Parliament, which, there was much reason to believe, suffered itself to be dealt with to enslave the nation, in several respects; and which, to his honour, the noble Earl of Danby procured to be dissolved, as the first step towards the deliverance of the nation? And whether it were reasonable to exclude all that conform not in every thing to the Church of England, from any part or share of the civil power? The author discussed these questions with much pertinence of illustration, and force of argument. Amongst other observations, he says, “ It ought to be considered that Christianity, wherein it superadds to the law of nature, is all matter of revelation; and it is well known, that even among Pagans, in settling rites and institutes of religion, revelation was pretended at least; upon an implied principle, that in such matters human power could not oblige the people’s consciences. This appears by the conduct of Numa, who affected to derive his pacific code of religious laws from the nymph Egeria. And the

“priests, to whom the regulation of such matters
“was left, were believed to be inspired.”

This small tract has been twice delivered to the public by Dr. Calamy; but as it cannot fail to gratify, we shall insert it in the Appendix.

The sentiments which Mr. Howe advanced and defended from the press, had the sanction of the King from the throne. In one of his speeches to the two Houses, March 18, 1689, he expressed his hope, “that they would leave room for the admission
“of all Protestants who were willing and able to serve
“him.” This he recommended as “a measure,
“which would more closely unite them together, and
“strengthen them against the common adversary.” Pursuant hereto, when the Act for abrogating the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and appointing other oaths, was read a second time in the House of Lords, a clause was proposed, to take away the necessity of receiving the Sacrament at Church to make a man capable of holding any office. This clause was afterwards reported to the House, but it was rejected by a great majority. The Lords Delamere, Stamford, North, Grey, Chesterfield, Wharton, Lovelace, and Vaughan, entered their protest against the decision of the House; a protest grounded on these principles: “That an hearty union
“amongst Protestants is a greater security to the
“Church and State, than any test that could be in-
“vented: that this obligation to receive the Sacrament,

• No. I. See also Calamy's Abridgement of Baxter's Life, vol. ii. P. 429—439; and Life of Mr. Howe, p. 146—262.

“ is a test on Protestants rather than on Papists: that
“ so long as it is continued, there could not be that
“ hearty and thorough union among Protestants
“ which has always been wished, and is at this time
“ indispensably necessary ; and lastly, that a greater
“ caution ought not to be required from such as
“ were admitted into offices, than from the Members
“ of the two Houses of Parliament, who were not
“ obliged to receive the Sacrament to enable them
“ to sit in either House.”*

This clause being lost; another modification of the Test Laws was proposed, by a clause of proviso, that any man should be sufficiently qualified for any office, employment, or place of trust, who, within a year before or after his admission or entrance thereinto, did receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, either according to the usage of the Church of England, or in any other Protestant congregation, and could produce a certificate under the hands of the Minister and two other credible persons, members of such a Protestant congregation. It was a recommendation of this proviso, that while it consulted the scruples of the moderate dissenter, it was an effectual barrier against the conscientious Papist's intrusion into office ; and left the mode and circumstances of receiving the Sacrament, as an instance of obedience to the divine institution, and a deliberate act of pure devotion, to the judgment and consciences of individuals. But the mild

* A complete Collection of Protests, p. 62, 63.—Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 170, 171.

counsels of wisdom and equity are not heard amidst the agitations of party.. On the question being put, this clause was likewise rejected by a great majority. Six Lords distinguished themselves by entering their dissent: namely, Oxford, Lovelace, Wharton, Mordaunt, Montague, and Paget. Their protest was placed on these grounds: “ That the rejection
“ of the clause gave a great part of the Protestant
“ freemen reason to complain of hard usage; and
“ it deprived the king and kingdom, for a mere
“ scruple of conscience, which implicated no cause of
“ suspicion or disaffection to the government, of the
“ services of divers fit and able men: That when the
“ King had, as the common and indulgent father of
“ his people, expressed an earnest desire of liberty
“ for tender consciences to his Protestant subjects,
“ and divers bishops had professed the same and
“ owned its reasonableness, there was reason to
“ apprehend it would, by confining secular employ-
“ ments to ecclesiastical conformity, raise suspicions
“ in men’s minds of something different from the case
“ of religion and the public, or a design to heal the
“ national breaches: That, to set a mark of humili-
“ liation and distinction on any sort of men, who had
“ not rendered themselves justly suspected to the
“ government, ought always to be avoided by the
“ makers of just and equitable laws; but would
“ have a particular ill effect on the reformed interest
“ at home and abroad, at a juncture that stood in
“ need of the united hands and hearts of all Pro-
“ testants: That it turned the edge of a law, intended

“ against Papists, upon Protestants and the friends
“ of government ; and made taking the Sacrament
“ the means of weakening the interest of Protestants,
“ by casting off a part of them: That as the mysteries
“ of religion and divine worship are of divine
“ original, and of a nature wholly distinct from the
“ secular affairs of public society, they cannot be
“ applied to those ends ; and, by the law of the
“ Gospel, and on the principles of prudence, offence
“ ought not to be given to tender consciences,
“ within or without the Church, by mixing sacred
“ mysteries with secular interests ; and, that to punish
“ any one without a crime is inconsistent with the
“ law of God, with common equity, and the right
“ of every free-born subject. If not to take the
“ Sacrament according to the usage of the Church
“ of England be a crime, every one ought to be
“ punished for it; this no one affirms : If it be no
“ crime, those who are capable and judged fit for
“ employment by the King, ought not to be punished
“ with a law of exclusion, for not doing that which
“ it is no crime to forbear : And that taking the Sa-
“ crament in any Protestant congregation would be
“ as effectual a test to discover and keep out Papists.”*

These Bills, which had a conciliatory tendency, having failed ; the object which had been proposed by them was brought forward under another form, in a Bill “ for uniting their ‘Majesties’ Protestant
“ subjects.” In the Committee this Bill underwent several amendments. Bishop Burnet moved a

* Collection of Protests, p. 64, 65.

proviso, that the subscription it requires to the Articles should only be, instead of assent and consent, to *submit*, with a promise of conformity. There was also a proviso for dispensing with kneeling at the Sacrament, and being baptized with the sign of the Cross, to such as, after conference upon those heads, should solemnly protest they were not satisfied as to the lawfulness of them. Another proviso was offered, that in imitation of the Acts passed in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., a number of persons, both of the clergy and laity, should be empowered to prepare such a reformation of things, relating to the Church, as might be offered to the King and Parliament, in order to heal the existing divisions, and to correct the errors and defects of the constitution. The first proviso was, obviously, little calculated to yield satisfaction to a scrupulous mind; for integrity would revolt at a promise of conforming to points, to which the judgment could not conscientiously and sincerely give its assent. And the bishop incurred, by moving it, the severe censure of the clergy; as he did also, by the zealous support which he gave to the clause for dispensing with the posture of kneeling at the Sacrament. The second proviso occasioned a warm debate; for the chief exception of the Dissenters being directed against the posture, it was thought that to give up this, was to open a way for them to come into employments: yet it was carried in the House of Lords. The third proviso, that some laymen should be included in the commission, was pressed with great

earnestness by many of the temporal lords. Bishop Burnet was against it for fear of offending the clergy; under an apprehension, that they would look upon it as taking the matter out of their hands, when he thought they were disposed to come into the design with zeal and unanimity. But he was soon afterwards convinced that he had taken a wrong measure, and that the method proposed by the temporal lords was the only one that was likely to prove effectual. Upon the question being put, the votes, with the proxies, were equal; and so it was, according to the ancient rule in like cases," "*semper præsumitur pro negante*," the decision was considered as a negative.

Leave was given to any lords to enter dissents: accordingly, the Marquis of Winchester, Lords Mordaunt and Lovelace, protested, on the following reasons: "That the act being designed for the peace
" of the state, exclusively to put the clergy into the
" commission, as if they alone were friends to it, laid
" an humiliation on the laity, as less able or less con-
" cerned to provide for it: That there could be no
" reason why commissioners for altering things of a
" civil constitution only, which derived their establish-
" ment from the King, Lords, and Commons, should
" consist of men of one order only; but on the
" supposition, that human reason was to be quitted in
" this affair, and the inspiration of spiritual men alone
" to be depended upon: That though, upon Romish
" principles, the clergy alone may have a right to
" meddle in matters of religion; yet this did not hold

“ where the Church was acknowledged to consist of
“ laity as well as clergy ; so those matters of religion
“ which fall under human determination, being pro-
“ perly the business of the Church, belong to both,
“ as neither clergy or laity can make any alteration in
“ divine institutions : That to plead, that the mixing
“ of laymen with ecclesiastics would frustrate the design
“ of the commission, by the rise of differences and
“ delays, was vain and out of doors ; unless on the
“ supposition that the clergy and laity have distinct
“ interests ; a reason, if good, why one or other should
“ quit the house, for fear of obstructing the business
“ of it : That the satisfaction of Dissenters being in-
“ tended by the commission, it was convenient, more
“ effectually to find expedients for that end, to mix in
“ it laymen of different ranks and of different opinions
“ too, than confine it only to clergymen, who are
“ observed to have generally much the same way of
“ reasoning and thinking : That the most ready way to
“ facilitate the passing of any alterations into a law,
“ was to join in the commission lay lords and com-
“ mons, who might be able to satisfy both houses of
“ the reasons upon which they were made ; and
“ thereby remove all fears and jealousies which evil
“ men might raise against the clergy, of endeavouring,
“ without grounds, to keep up a distinct interest from
“ that of the laity, whom they so carefully exclude
“ from joining with them in consultations of common
“ concernment, as to debar them from any part in the
“ deliberation, who have the greatest in the determi-
“ nation : That such a restricted commission was open

“ to this great objection, that it might be made use
“ of to evade repeated promises and the general
“ expectation of a compliance with tender con-
“ sciences; when providing for it was taken out
“ of the ordinary course of Parliament, and put
“ into the hands of those alone who were latest in
“ admitting any need of it, and who might be
“ thought, since they were looked upon by some as
“ parties, to be the more unfit to be the sole com-
“ posers of differences: And lastly, that it carried with
“ it a dangerous supposition, as if the laity were not
“ a part of the Church, nor had any power to meddle
“ in matters of religion; a supposition directly
“ opposite to the constitution both of church and
“ state; a supposition, which would make all altera-
“ tions utterly impossible, since what is established
“ by law cannot be taken away or changed but
“ by consent of laymen in Parliament, the clergy
“ themselves having no authority to meddle in this
“ very case, in which the laity are excluded by this
“ vote, but what they derive from lay hands.

To these reasons the Earl of Stamford added,
“ That as well on other grounds he dissented on this
“ reason; because it was contrary to the three
“ statutes made in the reign of Henry VIII. and one
“ in Edward VI. which empowered thirty-two com-
“ missioners to alter the canon and ecclesiastical
“ law, &c. whereof sixteen to be of the laity, and
“ sixteen of the clergy.”

This protest of the Lords has, with great propriety,
been characterized by a very sensible writer, as “ an

“admirable protest.”* But, as usual, the matter was decided more by the prejudices of party, than by the principles of reason and equity; and the protest of the lords had no other effect, than to express their own liberal and just sentiments, and to convey down to posterity a vindication of their own conduct. The bill was sent down to the House of Commons, and it was allowed to lie on the table. But instead of proceeding in it, they resolved on an address to the King, requesting him to summon a convocation of the clergy to attend, according to custom, on the session of Parliament. The Lords joined in this address, which was presented to his Majesty on the 20th of April. He returned no answer till the next day, when he declared that the Church of England should always be his peculiar care. He expressed his hope, that the ease designed for Dissenters, which the address professed it was their intention to take into consideration, would very much contribute to the establishment of the Church; he earnestly recommended it to them to remove the occasions of differences and animosities; and promised, as soon as it would be convenient, to summon a convocation.

The party that was now beginning to be formed against the government, says Bishop Burnet, pretended great zeal for the Church, and declared their apprehensions that it was in danger. These men, as they were unfriendly and reluctant even to the toleration, so they were much offended

* Belsham's History of William III. vol. i. p. 128.

with the Bill of Union, as containing matters relative to the Church, on which the representative body of the clergy had not even been convened. Even they who affected to be most favourable to the Dissenters did not give their support to the bill. Their maxim was, that it was necessary to keep up a strong faction in church and state. Any measures which would render so great a body as the Presbyterians easy, and conciliate their minds to the Church, were not, in their opinion, consistent with this maxim. The toleration, they conceived, would be best maintained, in proportion as the numbers who needed it, and were interested in the preservation of it, were great. On these principles the Bill of Union, being at once zealously opposed, and feebly supported, proved abortive.”*

The temper and situation of the nation, while this affair was agitated, appears from a conversation which took place in the presence of Sir John Reresby, governor of York, and afterwards a non-juror. A few days after their Majesties’ coronation, Dr. Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, complained to the Marquis of Halifax, lord privy seal, of the slow proceedings of the Commons, saying the Dutch would clap up a peace with France, if they did not mend their

* Burnet’s History of his own Times, vol. iv. p. 15, 16. It would interrupt the narrative by a long digression, were the reasons urged in favour of the Bill of Union, and against it, to be drawn out into a full statement; but it may give the reader satisfaction to see how the matter was argued, and assist him in judging of the principles on which the Bill was lost, if we lay before him, from the state papers, an abstract of those reasons. See Appendix II.

pace. He observed, that the Church of England was in the fault, and expressed himself as if he thought they meant a kindness to King James by their method of procedure. The Lord Privy Seal agreed with him in his sentiments ; and added, the Church people hated the Dutch, and would rather turn Papists than receive the Presbyterians among them : but that, on the other hand, these were to the full as rank and inveterate as those, and would marr all their business by their inadvertence with regard to their Bill of Comprehension, and their ill-timing of other bills ; in short, that they would disgust those from whom they looked for indulgence. Both his lordship and the bishop expressed their anger at the address which the Commons presented to the King on the day before, the 19th of April, reminding him of his promises to the Church of England, desiring him to support and defend it, and moving for a convocation. This, the bishop said, would be the utter ruin of the comprehension scheme.*

In this state of parties, and under this agitation of the public mind, it will appear an important point gained, that in May the Toleration Act, which we have already mentioned, passed with little opposition. When we reflect on the inefficiency of the more enlarged views and the liberal wishes expressed by the King ; on the unsuccessful issue of other conciliating measures, which were proposed ; and on the implacable hatred to the non-conformists shewn at that time by the clergy, who discovered a disposition to

* Sir John Reresby's Memoirs, p. 343, 344.

renew old severities; it may seem a matter of surprise that this Act was carried; an Act which gave a legal sanction to the religious assemblies of Protestant Dissenters, and put them under protection. “Wise and good men,” says Bishop Burnet, “did very much applaud the quieting the nation by the toleration. It seemed to be suitable, both to the spirit of the Christian religion, and to the interest of the nation. It was thought very unreasonable, that while we were complaining of the cruelty of the Church of Rome, we should fall into such practices among ourselves; chiefly, while we were engaging in a war, in the progress of which we should need the united strength of the whole nation.”*

This Act was a great acquisition. In language of high authority, that of Lord Mansfield, “It rendered that which was illegal before, now legal; the dissenting way of worship is permitted and allowed by that Act; it is not only exempted from punishment, but rendered innocent and lawful; it is *established*; it is put under the *protection*, and is not merely at the *connivance*, of the law.” From that time the human mind began to feel its powers, and to expand itself with freedom and vigour. Here was laid the basis of that religious liberty, which has been the felicity and honour of succeeding times; and it opened a way for further improvements and future enlargements in the spirit and exemptions of the Act itself. It is gratifying to

* History of his own Times, p. 16.

reflect that this Act has, we may hope not without effect, held up an instructive model to the rest of Europe ; and the principles of it, that is, just and enlarged sentiments on the rights of conscience, have been diffusing themselves over the continent, and have been transplanted into America.

But after every encomium to which it has a just claim has been bestowed upon it, this first charter of religious freedom was confused and partial. It by no means repealed all the penal statutes on the subject of religion. It left the laws against the Papists in full force.* It did not abrogate the statutes of Elizabeth and James I. that enact the inflicting of certain penalties on such as absent themselves from divine worship in the Established Church.† It still left heresy subject to cognizance in the ecclesiastical court ; and a clergyman convicted of it to depriva-

* For a summary of these laws, as they exist at present, see Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. iv. ch. 4. p. 55. Edition by Williams, 1791.

† “ About the year 1788, a poor man, a dissenter, in Cornwall, “ was libelled in the Spiritual Court for not attending divine worship “ at his parish church on the Lord's-day. He had not taken the “ oaths required by the Act of Toleration, but it being a sufficient “ defence to take them at any time during the prosecution, he applied “ to the Magistrates of the county at their Quarter-Sessions, who illegally *refused to administer them*. The consequence was, that he “ was excommunicated. Upon a representation from the Committee “ of Dissenters in London, for guarding the civil rights of the Dissent- “ ers, the Chairman of the Sessions acknowledged the error of the “ Justices, and the man took the oaths at the ensuing Sessions ; but it “ was then *too late*.” High Church Politics, p. 69. I remember about 1762, Mr. Banger, a grocer in extensive business, and a respectable character, at Seaton, a village in the south of Devon, having a

tion, degradation, and excommunication; and a layman to the latter with all its train of severities. Its operation and benefits are limited to Protestant Dissenters only; and did not embrace all of them, for Unitarian Christians are expressly excepted. As to those whom it does comprehend, its influence is confined. It has its exclusive clauses, not only requiring from all who would plead the benefits of it the oaths to government, but exacting of their teachers subscription to the thirty-nine articles, with an express exception, indeed, of those relating to the government and powers of the Church, and to infant baptism; but it did not supersede the Corporation and Test Acts; and, at this time, after repeated applications to Parliament renewed in different periods, the Dissenters still lie under the obloquy, still feel all the disabilities, attached to those Acts. The Toleration Act did not exonerate the Dissenters from the obligation imposed on them to contribute to the maintenance of the public religious establishment, though they do not attend on its ministrations. The Toleration Act did not give any sanction or permission to the solemnization of marriage in their own assemblies and by their own ministers. The Jews, indeed, have enjoyed that privilege, and the Quakers assumed it to themselves. There was great truth and

quarrel with the vicar, which led him to absent himself from the worship of the parish church, was threatened by him with the execution of the laws above mentioned; and to screen himself from proceedings on them, he joined a neighbouring congregation of Dissenters at Colyton, of which I was the Minister; and where he had before frequently attended.

propriety in the manner in which Mr. Locke represented the nature of this Act, in his letter to Limborch ; “ You have, I doubt not, heard before this, “ that toleration is at last established here by law. “ Not indeed with that latitude with which you and “ other Christians like you, free from ambition and “ prejudice, and lovers of truth, might wish. But “ it is a great point to proceed so far. In these “ beginnings are laid, I hope, those foundations “ of liberty and peace, in which the Church of “ CHRIST will be finally established.”

The King felt great satisfaction in passing this bill. It coincided with the fixed principle of his mind,—that conscience was the province of God, subject to his jurisdiction alone ; and not to be restrained by human impositions. The Dissenters were satisfied and thankful ; but it was the subject of regret with many of the clergy : Dr. Robert South, his biographer owns, by no means liked it.*

Though the Bill for a comprehension had failed, yet the Dissenters were encouraged in a hope that the great object would yet be obtained by other measures which were adopted to bring it about. The design was not relinquished by the King ; but renewed and pursued under another form. Dr. Tillotson, while the matter was depending before the House, reminded the King that the Reformation, because it rested on Parliamentary authority, was a subject of jest with the Catholics. That no new occasion might be given to a charge of this nature, he

* Calamy's Life of Mr. Howe, p. 163.

advised referring the matter to an ecclesiastical synod, as a mode of proceeding more agreeable to the clergy, and calculated to command the religious respect of the people. He judged it would be best, for the sake of expedition, and for bringing the affair to a point, that the King, as had formerly been the practice, by his letters patent should authorise a select number of learned divines to meet together, and consult on the most proper methods of healing the wounds of the Church ; and renewing harmony between it and the Dissenters, on permanent grounds. The scheme of union prepared by them was to be laid before the Convocation ; and if approved, it was to receive the sanction of Parliament.

The King acceded to this proposal ; and on 13th of September, 1689, invested ten bishops and twenty divines with an authority to prepare matters to be laid before the Convocation, under the direction of the following commission : “ Whereas the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged ; it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of time and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place and authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient : And whereas the book of canons is fit to be reviewed, and made more suitable to the state of the Church : And whereas

“ there are defects and abuses in the ecclesiastical
 “ courts and jurisdictions ; and particularly there
 “ is not sufficient provision made for the removing
 “ of scandalous ministers, and for the reforming
 “ of manners either in ministers or people : And
 “ whereas it is most fit, that there should be a strict
 “ method prescribed for the examination of such
 “ persons as desire to be admitted into holy orders,
 “ both as to their learning and manners : We
 “ therefore, out of our pious and princely care
 “ for the good order and edification and unity
 “ of the Church of England, committed to our
 “ charge and care, and for the reconciling, as much
 “ as is possible, of all differences among our good
 “ subjects, and to take away all occasions of like
 “ for the future, have thought fit to authorize and
 “ empower you, &c.* and any nine of you, whereof

* The *ten Bishops*, who were empowered to act under this commission, were Dr. Thomas Lamplugh, York ; Dr. Henry Compton, London ; Dr. William Lloyd, St. Asaph ; Dr. Thomas Sprat, Rochester ; Dr. Thomas Smith, Carlisle ; Dr. Jonathan Trelawney, Exeter ; Dr. Gilbert Burnet, Salisbury ; Dr. Humphrey Humphreys, Bangor ; Dr. Peter Mew, Winchester ; Dr. Nicholas Stratford, Chester.

The twenty Divines.—Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, dean of St. Paul’s, soon after bishop of Worcester ; Dr. Simon Patrick, dean of Peterborough, and soon after bishop of Chichester ; Dr. John Tillotson, dean of Canterbury, and soon after of St. Paul’s ; Dr. Richard Meggot, dean of Winchester ; Dr. John Sharp, dean of Norwich ; Dr. John Montagu, master of Trinity College, Cambridge ; Dr. John Goodman, archdeacon of Middlesex ; Dr. Wm. Beveridge, archdeacon of Colchester ; Dr. John Batteley, archdeacon of Canterbury ; Dr. Charles Alston, archdeacon of Essex ; Dr. Richard Kidder, soon after made dean of Peterborough ; Dr. Henry Aldrich, dean of Christ-Church, Oxford ; Dr. Wm. Jane,

“ three to be bishops, to meet from time to time,
“ as often as shall be needful, and to prepare such
“ alterations of the liturgy and canons, and such
“ proposals for the reformation of ecclesiastical
“ courts, and to consider such other matters, as in
“ your judgment may most conduce to the ends
“ above-mentioned.” Great care was taken in the
choice of these commissioners, Bishop Burnet says,
to name them so impartially, that no exception could
lie against any of them. Many of them were men
who held high stations in the Church, and by their
learning and virtues were distinguished ornaments of
it; as some of them then filled episcopal sees, so others
of them rose afterwards to the same eminence. A
respectable number of them, it may be concluded
from the spirit of their writings and their general
characters, were not indifferent to the attainment of
the pacific object of their commission. They had
before them all the books and papers that had at
any time been offered by the dissenters, exhibiting
their demands; for, before the civil wars, the Pu-
ritans had stated their objections to the service of the
established Church. The Nonconformists, after the
Restoration, had represented their grounds of dis-
approbation. And they were furnished with the

regius professor of divinity in the University of Oxford; Dr. John Hall, Margaret professor of divinity in the same University; Dr. Joseph Beaumont, regius professor in the University of Cambridge; Dr. Thomas Tenison, archdeacon of London; Dr. John Scott, prebendary of St. Paul's; Dr. Edward Fowler, prebendary of Gloucester; Dr. Robert Grove, prebendary of St. Paul's; and Dr. John Williams, prebendary of St. Paul's.

advices and propositions, which the most learned divines of the Church had at different times suggested, and of which Dr. Stillingfleet had made a great collection. The commissioners only resumed and gave new force to a design, which at the latter end of the preceding reign had been concerted by Dr. Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and which he formed partly out of tenderness to the Dissenters, and partly that the Church might not be unprovided with suitable and expedient plans of conduct at the Revolution, which his sagacity anticipated, as it had been at the Restoration. The commission under which they were to act, was not only a prudential but a necessary legal precaution ; as the clergy would have subjected themselves to the penalties of a *præmunire*, by attempting to frame new canons, without the King's leave first obtained.*

It had a favourable aspect on the design of the commission, that Dr. Tillotson, one of the commissioners, drew up a paper entitled “ Concessions, “ which will probably be made by the Church of “ England for the union of Protestants ;” which on September 13, 1689, he sent by Dr. Stillingfleet, another commissioner of great weight of character, to the Earl of Portland. The plan of accommodation proposed in it was to leave indifferent the ceremonies enjoined, or recommended in the liturgy or canons; to revise the liturgy carefully, leaving out the apocryphal lessons, correcting the translation of

* Bellham's History of Great-Britain from the Revolution, vol. i. p. 130 ; and Burnet, vol. iv. p. 44.

the Psalms where it was necessary, and making such alterations as would supply defects, or remove every ground of exception: to substitute, in the room of all former declarations and subscriptions, one general declaration or promise, viz. to submit to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of England, as it shall be established by law, and to teach and practise accordingly, as the condition of being admitted to exercise the office of the sacred ministry in it. To frame, with a view to the more effectual reformation of manners in ministers and people, a new body of ecclesiastical canons; to take out of the hands of lay-officers, and to invest in the bishops, the power of excommunication, confining its exercise to great and important occasions; and to introduce an effectual regulation of the ecclesiastical courts: not to require, as a term of preferment in the Church of England, those who had been ordained in any foreign reformed Church, to be re-ordained: to limit, in future, the capacity of holding any ecclesiastical benefice or preferment in the Church of England, to those who are ordained by bishops, with a provision that those who had been ordained by presbyters only should not be compelled to renounce their former ordination. And with another provision to meet the scruples of those who, when episcopal ordination might be had and was required by law, doubted of the validity of ordination merely by presbyters; the Doctor proposed, that it should be sufficient for such persons to receive ordination from a bishop in this or the like form, “if thou art not

“already ordained, I ordain thee, &c.” As in case a doubt should arise as to any one’s baptism, it is appointed by the liturgy, that he be baptized in this form, “If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee.”*

The ecclesiastical commissioners opened their commission in the Jerusalem Chamber on the 10th of October 1689. Some who were named in it either did not appear : or soon deserted their brethren, among these were Dr. Mew, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Spratt, bishop of Rochester, both of whom had, for some time, acted under the very illegal and tyrannical ecclesiastical commission set up by James II. in 1686 ; illegal, as contrary to the statute by which the high commission had been put down in 1641 ; and tyrannical, as it invested the commissioners with a power to proceed in all ecclesiastical matters in a summary and arbitrary way. These prelates, who had acted under a commission contrary to law, and had sanctioned a stretch of prerogative which was designed to oppress even the clergy, on the present occasion, when the object was to unite discordant parties and to establish Protestantism on the firm basis of union, felt peculiar scruples. These prelates, as a judicious historian says with a keen but a too just severity of one of them, Dr. Spratt, “proved themselves to belong to that odious and “pharisaical fraternity, who strain at a gnat and “swallow a camel.” They pleaded, that by an Act of Parliament in the reign of King Henry VIII. the clergy were laid under an obligation not to enter

* Dr. Birch’s Life of Archbishop Tillotson, p. 182—184.

into any debates about making alterations in Church affairs, without the King's special and immediate knowledge and direction first given concerning such alterations. It was replied, that of the three methods of doing this, either by an act of the King's own judgment, or by a private cabal, or by a commission to a certain number of ecclesiastics to consult and prepare matters, that which was liable to the least exception was adopted. It was further urged, that the commissioners possessed no legislative power in this business, but were to report and submit their proceedings and resolutions to the Convocation: that they were not to be referred to the privy-council, to avoid the suspicion and imputation of their being moulded by the judgment, and carried by the influence, of laymen. But such arguments had no weight with those who were averse from any alterations, and who thought too much had been conceded by the Act of Toleration to Dissenters, whom they looked upon as a peevish and obstinate party, and who, they affected to think, would be made insolent by concessions. With the prelates whom we have already named, Dr. Aldrich and Dr. Jane also withdrew.*

* See the new edition of Neal's History of the Puritans, b. v. p. 26, 27. Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 192.

ALDRICH AND JANE.—These names, of eminence and weight in their day, call for some particular notice here. Dr. Henry Aldrich, born in Westminster in 1647, was a pupil of the famous Dr. Busby, and was elected student of Christ-Church, Oxford, 1662. In due time he entered into holy orders, and became a celebrated tutor. In 1681, he was installed canon of Christ-Church, and

The rest of the commissioners closely applied themselves, for several weeks, to the work assigned them. The points brought under review were well considered: their debates were conducted with calmness and freedom: the object pursued was the entire correction of every thing that appeared to

became its dean in 1689: He presided over this College with great zeal for its interests, and being a single man, with a munificent patronage. That excellent piece of architecture called Peckwater Quadrangle was designed by him. He annually published, as a new-year's gift to the students of his house, a piece of some ancient Greek author. He wrote a System of Logic, which passed through several editions; and with Bishop Sprat, revised Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion." He had a great share in the Popish Controversy, during the reign of King James II. Besides the above preferments, he held the rectory of Wem in Shropshire; and in 1702, was chosen Prolocutor of the Convocation. He died at Christ-church, on the 14th of December 1710, in the 63d or 64th year of his age, and was buried in the Cathedral, according to his own direction, without any memorial, on the south side of Bishop Fell's grave. He is represented to have been an universal scholar, and to have had a fine taste for architecture. His manners, we are told, were liberal, and his modesty and humility evident and acknowledged. The greatest part of his income was expended in works of hospitality and beneficence, especially in the encouragement of learning; and his government of the college reflected on him peculiar honour.—Goadby's British Biography, b. viii. p. 42, note.

Dr. WM. JANE was the son of Joseph Jane, esq; of Liskeard, Cornwall, author of "Ikou Aklastos," or Image unbroken, in answer to Milton, and Member for the borough of Liskeard, in the Long Parliament, under Charles the First. He was a great sufferer for his adherence to the house of Stuart. His son Dr. William Jane was born at Liskeard about the year 1644. He was educated at Westminster school, from which he was elected a student of Christ-church, Oxford, in 1660. After he had entered into holy orders, he became lecturer of Carfax church, Oxford, chaplain to Dr. Compton bishop of London, and prebendary of St. Paul's. In 1674, he took his degree of bachelor of divinity. In 1678, he

furnish just ground of disunion : a sincere wish was entertained to obviate the difficulties felt by the Dissenters on the subject of conformity ; and a hope was indulged, that if the prejudices of the present day could not be overcome, a way would be made, by removing the chief objections, for the more effectual and universal influence of conciliating measures on the next generation.

Under such auspicious circumstances commenced the proceedings of the commissioners. They began with reviewing the liturgy : and first they examined the calendar, in which, in the room of *apocryphal* lessons, they ordered certain chapters of canonical scriptures to be read, that were more for the edification of the people. The Athanasian creed being disliked by many persons, on account of the damnable clauses, it was left to the minister's choice to use

was installed canon of Christ-church. In 1679, he proceeded doctor of divinity. In 1681, he was admitted regius professor of divinity. In 1685, he was installed dean of Gloucester, and held with it the precentorship of the church of Exeter. He lived some years after Queen Anne's accession to the throne, without obtaining any higher preferment, and died on the 6th of February 1706-7. He published some occasional Sermons, and a Treatise entitled, "The present Separation self-condemned, and proved to be Schism," 1678, 4to. "Some Queries on the New Commission, &c. in a Letter to a Friend," a single sheet, 1689, were ascribed to him. He was also considered as having a chief hand in promoting and penning the judgment and decree of the University of Oxford against certain seditious books and damnable doctrines, passed in the Convocation there July 1683, presented to and approved by Charles II., but burnt by the hangman in pursuance to an order of the House of Lords in 1720.—Birch's Life of Tiltonson, p. 188—189; and British Biography, vol. ix. p. 32, note

or change it for the Apostles' creed. New collects were drawn up more agreeable to the epistles and gospels, for the whole course of the year, and with a force and beauty of expression capable of affecting and raising the mind in the strongest manner. The first draft of them was composed by Dr. Patrick, who was esteemed to have a peculiar talent for devotional compositions: Dr. Burnet added to them yet greater force and spirit; Dr. Stillingfleet then examined every word in them with the most exact judgment: and Dr. Tillotson gave them as it were their last polish, by the masterly touches of his natural and flowing eloquence. Dr. Kidder, who was well versed in the oriental languages, made a new version of the Psalms more conformable to the original. Dr. Tennison having collected throughout the liturgy the words and expressions to which exceptions had been made, proposed others in their room, which were more clear and plain, and less liable to objection. Other things were proposed, to be determined by the Convocation; particularly that the cross in baptism might be either used or omitted, at the discretion of the parents.*

* Calamy's Abridgement of Baxter's Life, vol. i. p. 451. Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 190, 191. The above abstract of the proceedings of the commissioners was communicated to Dr. Nicholls by Dr. John Williams, afterwards bishop of Chichester. The original copy of the alterations suggested by the commissioners upon their review of the liturgy was deposited with Dr. Tennison: he was always cautious of trusting them out of his own keeping; alleging that the publication of them, says Dr. Birch, would not satisfy either side; but rather furnish a handle for mutual reproaches.

The commissioners proceeded very unanimously in adopting numerous other alterations. Each article, as soon as they determined to introduce it into their plan, was signed by the Bishop of London. It was agreed, that the chaunting of divine service in cathedrals should be laid aside: that devout and proper psalms should, besides the reading of them in course as before, be selected for Sundays: that in the room of the lessons from the Apocrypha and those from the Old Testament, which were too *natural*, others should be appointed in a new calendar already fully settled, in which are omitted all the legendary saints'-days, and others not directly referred to in the service book: that, not to send the vulgar to search the canons, which few of them ever saw, a rubric be made setting forth the usefulness, as a fit and decent ceremony, of the cross in baptism, though not essential to it; and allowing the priest to omit it, if any in conscience scruple it; permitting him also to administer the Lord's Supper to those who refuse kneeling, in their pews; and declaring the intention of the Lent fasts to consist only in extraordinary acts of devotion, not in distinction of meats; stating the meaning of Rogation Sundays and Ember Weeks, and enjoining the exercise of strict devotion on those ordained within the *quatuor tempora*: That the rubric which obliges

One side would, he apprehended, upbraid their brethren for giving up too much: the other, on the ground that these concessions were too little, or were not passed into a law, would justify their nonconformity.

the minister to read or hear common prayer publicly or privately every day, be changed into an exhortation to the people to frequent those prayers: That the absolution in morning and evening prayer may be read by a deacon, the word *priest* in the Rubric being changed into *minister*, and these words, *and remission*, as not very intelligible, be erased: that the *Gloria Patri* shall not be repeated at the end of every psalm, but of all appointed for morning and evening prayer: That those words in the *Te Deum*, “thine honourable, true, and “only son,” as “honourable” is a civil term only, and never used *in sacris*, be thus turned, “thine “only begotten son: That the “*Benedicite*” be changed into the 128th psalm, and other psalms likewise be appointed for the “*Benedictus*” and “*Nunc dimittis* :” That the versicles after the Lord’s Prayer, &c. to avoid the trouble and inconvenience of so often varying the posture in the worship, shall be read kneeling; and a promisory answer of keeping God’s law or the like, on the part of the people shall follow those words, “Give peace “in our time, O Lord,” the old response being grounded on too strict an acceptation of the predestinating doctrine: That all high titles or appellations of the King and Queen, such as “most illustrious, “religious, mighty,” &c. be left out of the prayers, and only the word “sovereign” be retained for the King and Queen: That those words in the prayer for the King, “Grant that he may vanquish and “overcome all his enemies,” as of too large an

extent if he engage in an unjust war, shall be turned, "Prosper all his righteous undertakings against thy enemies," or after some such manner; that in the prayer for the clergy, those words, "who alone workest great marvels," as subject to be ill interpreted by persons vainly disposed, shall be changed thus, "who alone art the author of all good gifts;" and these words "the healthful spirit of thy grace" shall be altered into this phrase, "the holy spirit of thy grace;" "healthful" being an obsolete word: That the prayer which begins, "O God, whose nature and property,"* shall be thrown out, as full of strange and impertinent expressions, and besides as not in the original, but foisted in since by another hand: That the collects for the most part be changed for those which the Bishop of Chichester has prepared; being a revival of the old ones, with enlargements to render them more sensible and affecting, and a retrenchment of needless expressions: That if any minister refuse to use the surplice, while the people desire it and the living will bear it, the bishop may substitute in his place one who will officiate in it; but that the whole matter be left to the discretion of the

* The Prayer, to which exception is made above, is left out of our present copies of the Book of Common Prayer. It stood thus in an edition of 1629, now before me:

"O God, whose nature and property is ever to have mercy,
 "receive our humble petitions; and though we be tied and bound
 "with the chaine of our sinnes, yet let the pitifulnesse of thy great
 "mercy loose us, for the honour of Jesus Christ's sake, our media-
 "tor and advocate. Amen."

bishop: That if any desire to have Godfathers and Godmothers omitted, and to present their children in their own names to baptism, it be granted: That, lest wholly rejecting the Athanasian Creed should by unreasonable persons be imputed to them as Socinianism, a rubric should be made, setting or declaring the curses denounced therein not to be restrained to every particular article, but intended against those that deny the substance of the Christian religion in general: and lastly, That it be wholly left to the convocation to consider and determine whether the amendment of the translation of the *reading Psalms*, as they are called, made by the Bishop of St. Asaph and Dr. Kidder, or that in the Bible, shall be inserted in the Prayer Book.* Some alterations were also made in the litany, the communion service, &c. and the canons.

Besides the above alterations in the forms of public devotion, which the commissioners agreed to lay before the convocation, it was also an object of their pious attention to provide a family book to be authorised by that assembly. It contained directions for family devotions, with several forms of prayer for morning and evening, suited to the different circumstances of the families for whose use they were composed.†

* Calamy's Abridgment of the Life of Baxter, p. 452—455, vol. i. Birch's Life of Archbishop Tillotson, p. 192

* The Life of Dr. Humphrey Prideaux, p. 61. "Family devotion had been kept up through all the nation, till the civil war broke out in 1641. It had been conducted by the help of

Such were the proceedings of the commissioners. Those who review them at this distance of time, and free from the party prejudices and designs under the influence of which the judgment of men was then formed, must regard them as founded in wisdom, moderation, and liberality of spirit. The alterations in the public services of the church which they proposed, were not only necessary to remove scruples and to invite the dissentients to conformity, but it was for the credit and honour of the church to discard

“precomposed forms. Afterwards the length of extempore prayers, which the Puritans carried to an extravagant excess, and the disgusting improprieties and cant introduced by many into them, brought family devotion itself into disrepute, especially in the reign of Charles II.; for then it was an expression of aversion from the sectaries, and of loyalty to the Court, to brand many things with the imputation of fanaticism, because a fanatical spirit had unhappily been blended with them. Of this kind was family prayer, which, on this ground, in compliance with the prevailing vogue, was neglected by numbers. The Book of Common Prayer, which had been extravagantly run down, on the change of times, was as extravagantly extolled by the High Church party, as if no other prayers were proper to be used in families any more than in churches.” The consequence was, that as they were more particularly framed to be read only by men in orders; when, in the families of noblemen and high rank there was no chaplain, they sank into disuse. This was another cause, to which was owing the total neglect of family worship. It was to provide a remedy for this decay of devotion, that the commissioners prepared instructions and services for domestic religion. After the convocation was broken up, Dr. Prideaux and others, sensible of the great influence of the religion of families on the state of piety in the world, were exceedingly earnest for the publication of this book. The Doctor very strongly urged this on Archbishop Tennison; but, as it should seem, an opportunity of obtaining the concurrence and sanction of a future convocation, without which the Archbishop was very reluctant to its publication, did not offer, the book never made its appearance, and was eventually lost.—See p. 61—66.

from its services all improprieties, and whatever was inconsistent with good sense and taste. The measures which the commissioners were authorised to adopt, derived a sanction from the revival of the established forms that had taken place in 1661. They derived a recent sanction from the line of conduct which the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Sancroft, as we have intimated, had pursued. He was one of the revisers in 1661. When afterwards he was advanced to the archiepiscopal see, conscious of the imperfections of our liturgy, he stood foremost in projecting a plan, by which that, together with the articles, &c. might be brought under a proper review and be fairly examined. "This excellent prelate," observes a late Noble writer,* "gave at least this early testimony, that he who had borne in 1661 a part in framing them, had never considered these matters as *finally* concluded. He went farther; for he made public his opinion by circulating his directions thereupon to the bishops and clergy of his province; his last act, I believe, as Metropolitan." This was a weighty recommendation to the proceedings of the commissioners who were employed in carrying into effect the plan which Sancroft had not the opportunity of bringing forward, but which he had shewn a strong disposition to patronise and assist.

Several publications, shewing the reasonableness and necessity of making proper alterations and obvia-

* "Hints submitted to the serious attention of the Clergy, &c." a tract, for which there is no doubt the public is indebted to the pen of his Grace the late Duke of Grafton. p. 24.

ting objections, came out about this time from the pens of learned and respectable characters in the church; especially from Dr. Prideaux dean of Norwich, who addressed the public on the subject in different tracts. In one entitled "A Letter to a Member of Parliament," he observed, "that no alteration was intended, but in things declared to be alterable by the church itself. And if things alterable be altered upon the grounds of prudence and charity, and things defective be supplied, and things abated be restored to their proper use, and things of a more ordinary composition revised and improved; whilst the doctrine, government, and worship of the church remain entire, in all the substantial parts of them; we have all reason to believe, that this will be so far from injuring the church, that on the contrary it shall receive a great benefit by it."*

Dr. Burnet, the bishop of Salisbury, delivered a discourse at St. Lawrence, Jewry, on November 16, from Acts vii. 26, with an evident view to the conciliatory measures which were then in contemplation. It was a seasonable, earnest, and impressive exhortation to peace and union. His lordship lamented the long contest which had existed about things confessed by all to be indifferent; and the alarm which had been taken at the smallest efforts made to reconcile the contending parties. The proposed alterations, he observed, were of themselves desirable; though not one dissenter should be gained by them;

* As quoted in the "Free and Candid Disquisitions," p. 281, 282.

and they were such as tended to render all offices of the church both more unexceptionable and more edifying. He urged, that instead of indulging the pride of not yielding to one another in any thing, they should rather engage, with a holy emulation, to try who could concede most for the healing of those wounds that had been so often opened and that began then to bleed afresh. Referring to the Act of Toleration, which had lately been passed, his discourse breathed these enlarged sentiments of liberality; "God be thanked for it," said the bishop, "that there is an end to all persecution in matters
" of conscience; and that the first and chief right
" of human nature, of following the dictates of
" conscience in the service of God, is secured to all
" men amongst us; and that we are freed, I hope,
" for ever from all the remains of the worst part of
" Popery that we had too long retained, I mean
" the spirit of persecution. If this give uneasiness
" to any, it shews that their eye is evil, because the
" eye of our legislators has been good towards those
" who, though they may be mistaken in their
" notions, yet have still the rights of men and of
" Christians. But after all this, it is to be remem-
" bered, that men may be still persecutors, though
" they are not able to persecute any longer, accord-
" ing to our Saviour's charging the guilt of intended
" sins on those who never acted them: for as long
" as we entertain hatred and malice in our hearts,
" and wish that it were in our power to do others
" hurt, so long we become guilty before God, and

“ so do wrong to ourselves, though we are not in a
“ condition to do them any ; but if we do them
“ all the wrong we can, we shew what our tempers
“ are, and that we would do more if it were in our
“ power. If we love to keep up old differences
“ or to create new ones ; if we will continue to make
“ the terms of communion with us as strait as pos-
“ sibly we can, and shut out all persons, as much as
“ in us lies, from joining labours with us, because
“ they do not in all things think as we do ; if we
“ will by turns employ all the interest we have in
“ any turn of government that is kind to us, to do
“ wrong to others, either by loading them with
“ false accusations, by aggravating some lesser mat-
“ ters, or by an undue prosecution of real but re-
“ pented faults : all these are the several instances,
“ in which an injurious temper shews itself ; and
“ while such things are among us, we are under
“ the guilt that is charged on those Israelites in my
“ text, who though they were brethren, yet did
“ wrong one to another.”*

A measure, like that of this proposed comprehen-
sion, so suited to the state of parties, sanctioned by a
royal proclamation, conducted by the most eminent
ecclesiastics, powerfully recommended from the pul-
pit, and that would give a new aspect to the religious
establishment, could not fail to excite much attention.
An ecclesiastical commission, so different from that
of the former reign, did accordingly draw the

* As quoted by Calamy, abridgement of the life of Baxter,
vol. i. p. 455—457.

thoughts of men to it, and became the subject of all their discourse. It was earnestly patronised by the approbation and good wishes of some. It was as warmly censured and opposed by others.

The advocates for it alleged that it was consonant to the laws of the land ; that precedents, since the reformation in the reigns of Edward VI. Elizabeth, James I. and Charles II. justified it : that instead of interfering with the province of the convocation, it was only preparatory to its proceedings : that proposals, not impositions, were the conclusions in which the deliberations of the commissioners terminated. The religious denomination of the commissioners, as churchmen ; their rank as bishops, deans, and archdeacons ; their claim to sit in the convocation ; their reputation for abilities, probity, and worth ; were pleaded. It was urged that the best church is not absolutely perfect in all circumstantial things, nor can ever be made so here on earth : that churches, as well constituted at first as the age and case would bear, may, in process of time, admit of alterations and improvements : that the constitution, notwithstanding that of 1661, was still capable of another revival : that if there was reason at that time for the alterations proposed, which were computed to be about six hundred, there was equal if not greater reason for some additional improvements ; and that if then they had offered to move much further, a stone would have been laid under their wheel by a secret but powerful hand. On the principle of policy and selfish feelings, it was observed that the

conformists would derive pleasure and comfort from the strength and beauty which suitable alterations would add to the house, in which they were resolved to live and die; and that the dissenters, if they were not gained over by these concessions, would be left inexcusable. The desire of their Majesties, the concurrence of the Lords in the Bill of Union, and the expectation of the reformed churches looking for the adoption of measures friendly to peace and union, were considered as circumstances that rendered the present time a fit juncture for such a design.

To these pleas it was replied, to what purpose was it to begin, when it was not seen at what point to end? Was it not better to endure some inconveniences, from which no constitution is exempted, than to expose themselves to certain mischiefs? When, in 1661, six hundred alterations had no competent effect, what could be now expected? The true conformists, it was alleged, were very well satisfied with their house, and contented to live and die in it: that if dissenters would take possession of that house, make breaches in it, deface its beauty, undermine its strength, and force them to leave it, they could not take it well: that the desires of their Majesties were best known by their living in the communion of the Established Church, and by their declarations to favour and protect it: that the sense of the lords must be judged of by the sequel: that the dissenters ought to be satisfied with the toleration granted to them by statute, which the partizans of the church could not gain, for almost twenty years,

in the civil wars : and that the reformed churches generally admired the English constitution. Many avowed it as their opinion, that no alterations ought at all to be made in things pertaining to religion, but when there was a great necessity : that there was no such necessity : that if there were, it was not then a seasonable time, when so many fathers of the church and eminent clergymen, on account of their suspension for not taking the oaths, were incapable of acting in the affair.

By some of moderate sentiments and temper it was readily granted, that frequent alterations would be dangerous to religion ; but even they asserted the necessity of alterations in the present case. They asserted the indispensable obligation of doing the utmost that could be done to remove the evils of a schism which had very long disturbed the Christian church in these lands ; and which would most certainly lie at the door of those who did not use their best endeavours to remove them : that no way of attempting it was left, but by offering moderate and temperate terms to the dissentients, whom persuasions had not mollified, nor arguments convinced ; and whom church censures and penal laws had only irritated. The remedy which now offered was to concede, as far as possible, with respect to those excepted passages in the liturgy, and those ceremonies in the worship, to which their dissenting brethren could not conform. They asked, with propriety and force and with a lenient spirit, “ What are those “ things about which we differ, that we must for

“ ever sacrifice to them the peace both of church
“ and state, without abating the least tittle for so
“ great a good as that of the common union of
“ Christians among us? Is it not enough that for
“ the sake of trifles we have for these thirty years past
“ driven up our divisions and animosities against each
“ other to such a height, as that we had almost
“ totally given up our church to popery, and our
“ government to tyranny? Certainly it is now time
“ to sit down and consider, whether those things, for
“ the sake of which we bring so much mischief to
“ this poor distressed church and nation, are of so
“ great a value, that nothing must be abated of that
“ unreasonable rigour whereby we have hitherto
“ maintained them. Could but an union be once
“ effected amongst ourselves, we need not fear all
“ the power of France and Rome in the firmest union
“ against us.”

While the measures proposed by the commissioners recommended themselves to the minds of many as “ wise, equitable, and pacific,” there existed, as we have noticed, in the opinion of others, who viewed them in a different light, strong objections against them, which the advocates for the measures endeavoured to obviate. The timid were alarmed at the idea of altering any thing in a well-constituted church. It was like drawing a beam out of a well-built house, which could not be done without endangering the fabric. They did not perceive that this apprehension, if men had yielded to it, would have effectually prevented the reformation from popery. The cautious

were deterred from beginning, because they could not foresee where the alterations would stop; though it was replied, that they would stop when any thing not fit to be done was proposed. On the same spirit, it was objected, they who want alterations will be still craving for more. It was answered, that to deny what it was just and fitting to grant, was to give them a great advantage, and to afford ground for complaint and remonstrance. An affected delicacy for the honour of the church pleaded that changing was reproachful: the reflection never occurred, that it was more reproachful obstinately to resist a change, for which good reasons might be alleged. With a temper peculiarly illiberal and uncandid, it was urged by some that the Dissenters were obstinate and perverse, and that there was no reason to endeavour to gratify them. They who reasoned thus, were reminded of the conduct of physicians who do not presently cast off a peevish patient, but study to suit his palate and humour; which pattern of skill and gentleness it became them to imitate; and, as an objection to the proceedings was drawn from the absence of the suspended bishops and clergy, and the want of their aid and concurrence; it was answered, that the needful alterations might be made without them; and that their approbation, if they were true to the public interest, or their own promises, might be undoubtedly expected.

These reasonings and pleas, though they came from eminent persons of the church, did not in the least degree move those who had fixed their *ne plus*

ultra, and were resolved not to advance a step, of their own good-will, beyond the line drawn by their forefathers. The Acts for Uniformity were represented as much more effectual securities for union, than any alterations could be which the church was able justly to sanction. If the Act of Uniformity has made one dissenter, toleration and alterations, it was said, have created hundreds.*

Among the tracts published on this occasion, one, from its title "*Vox Cleri*,†" may be supposed to express both the spirit and sentiments of the clergy, who were inimical to any alterations. Of this production, the following passages will give the reader a specimen.

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 458—460.

† The tract entitled "*Vox Cleri*" was imputed to Mr. Thomas Long, a prebendary of Exeter. It was opposed by "*An answer to Vox Cleri, &c. examining the reasons against any alterations and abatements in order to a comprehension, and shewing the expediency thereof;*" said to be written by Dr. Wm. Payne, 1690, 4to. "*Vox Populi, or the Sense of the sober Laymen of the Church of England, concerning the heads proposed in his Majesty's Commission to the Convocation,*" 1690, 4to. "*Vox Regis et Regni, or a Protest against Vox Cleri, and a persuasive (thereby occasioned) to make such alterations as may give ease to our dissenting brethren,*" 1690, 4to. And "*Two Letters and a vindication of them, concerning alterations in the liturgy, by Mr. Bassett,*" 1689, 4to. The "*Answer to Vox Cleri*" was replied to in a "*just Censure of it;*" and Dr. Henry Maurice, chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft, published "*Remarks from the country upon the two letters relating to the Convocation and alterations.*"* The spirit and prejudices of Mr. Long, the supposed author of the "*Vox Cleri*," are expressed by his own pen in the tenor of his characteristical epitaph on Mr. Baxter, given from Dr. Grey in my edition of Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. v. p. 7, note.

* Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 210.

“ There is,” this writer observes, “ no necessity
“ that we should expose ourselves to that reproach
“ which is endeavoured to be fixed on some of us,
“ of being ecclesiastical tinkers, who undertaking to
“ mend one hole do usually make two or three.
“ We have, by standing our ground, put to flight one
“ formidable enemy; and is there a necessity that by
“ giving ground, we should bring ourselves under
“ the power of another? What though there be
“ some few that are really but causelessly offended at
“ our ceremonies, must we for their sake give offence
“ to the Church of God? What necessity is there
“ that for the sake of a few ignorant or peevish or
“ unsatisfiable persons, that will not be pleased with
“ all that we can do, we should confirm them in their
“ obstinacy, by yielding and complying with their
“ humours? Is it necessary,” the author proceeds,
“ that a parent should yield to a disobedient child
“ upon his own unreasonable terms? Is it necessary
“ that a church, in which all things necessary to
“ salvation may be freely enjoyed, should accuse her-
“ self of the want of Christian charity, and of im-
“ posing such sinful terms for admitting others into
“ her communion, as were purposely designed to
“ keep them out, and afterwards voluntarily cast off
“ those things, and thereby confess themselves guilty
“ of so great uncharitableness? Is it necessary that
“ we should part with any thing to them, of whom
“ we have reason to suspect that they will not leave
“ craving till they have all? When these things,
“ and such as these, are proved to be necessary, then

“ shall we be ready to make alterations in our cere-
“ monies, and other circumstances : in the mean
“ time we shall account ourselves happy in the num-
“ ber of those Englishmen, who know when they
“ are well off.”*

The language and strain of these paragraphs attest the truth and correctness of the preceding statement. They are dictated in a high tone of authority. The writer, and they whom he represented, had forgotten the principles of the Reformation ; they had forgotten the lessons of their Divine Master: “ Call no man
“ master, nor be ye called rabbi, for one is your
“ master, even CHRIST, and *all ye ARE BRETHREN.*
“ Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise
“ dominion over them ; and they that are great ex-
“ ercise authority upon them : *but it shall NOT BE*
“ *SO AMONG YOU.*”

While these debates were agitated, and matters were argued on both sides, the party in the interest of the abdicated king availed themselves of the occasion to inflame the minds of men. They raised the cry, that the church was to be pulled down, and the presbytery to be set up ; that the design was to divide and distract the church ; and under the offer of such concessions, to betray and enfeeble it, and to expose it to ridicule. The Universities took the alarm ; and began to protest against the plan, and against all who promoted it, as persons whose intentions were to weaken the church. Severe reflections, were also thrown out against the King for joining

* As quoted by Calamy, p. 461.

an interest inimical to it. The "Church" was the *Shibboleth* of the day; the word given out by the Jacobite faction, under which they thought they might more safely shelter themselves. General expectation was directed forward to the meeting of the convocation in December, as to the period when these differences would be brought to an authoritative determination. In every quarter there were great canvassings in the election of members of the convocation, a thing not known in former times. It was soon very visible, that the temper of men was not cool and calm enough to encourage the prosecution of a pacific and liberal design.*

The zeal both of the friends to the object of the commission, and of those who opposed it, was directed to the appointment of the prolocutor of the lower house of convocation at the ensuing meeting. The former and the Court were solicitous to carry the election of Dr. Tillotson, the dean of St. Paul's. His prudence and moderation would improve the influence that being in the chair would give him, to promote the ends for which the convocation was called. The other party set up as his competitor Dr. Jane, dean of Gloucester and regius professor of divinity in Oxford; whom disappointment and ambition, as well as his principles, disposed to counteract whatever was to be submitted to the convocation. The general temper of the clergy was in favour of his election; and it was effectually secured by the intrigues of two noblemen, the Earls of Clarendon

* Burnet's History, vol. iv. p. 46, 47.

and Rochester, who, on their mothers' side, were nephews to the Queen; and who, on this ground, had raised their expectation of being appointed to some of the higher employments under the new government. Disappointed in their aspiring views, resentment instigated them to use their efforts to embarrass the measures which they were not invited to conduct. Among other schemes, they set themselves to defeat the objects for which the clerical assembly had been convened; and with this design they directed their thoughts to Dr. Jane, as a competitor with Dr. Tillotson. They went to Oxford to bring him over to their counsels, and found him very ready, from mortified ambition, to concur in all their proposals. The Dean of Gloucester, with three other deputies, had waited on the Prince of Orange at Hungerford, on his march to London, to offer him the plate of the University of Oxford, which the Prince handsomely refused; and from a high opinion of the merit of his services, he asked a nomination to the see of Exeter, then vacant by the translation of Bishop Lamplugh to the archiepiscopal see of York; but his request was not granted, because the preferment he solicited had been previously promised to Dr. Trelawney bishop of Bristol: at this he was so disgusted, that he became ever after a professed enemy to King William and his government.* Dr. Tillotson had also from, a similar cause, an opponent in one of the commissioners,

* Prideaux's Life, p. 54, 55, 56.

Dr. Compton bishop of London, who was jealous of the Dean of St. Paul's, under an apprehension that the see of Canterbury, of which he had once before, on the translation of Dr. Sancroft to it, been disappointed, was intended for Dr. Tillotson. This preferment he conceived to be due to himself, not only as a reward for his conduct, both before and during the revolution, but on the ground of his rank and family.* Thus private resentments and personal views were opposed to the liberal intentions of the government; and with an insidious and concealed influence these selfish feelings obstructed and even defeated measures of extensive and national importance.

The convocation met on the 21st of November 1689. The Bishop of London was chosen prolocutor of the upper house, and Dr. Jane of the lower. This election put an end to the hopes of those who wished for a comprehension. The sermon, in Latin, was preached by Dr. Beveridge, who observed that “to change old laws for new is always dangerous, unless such a necessity constrain as is otherwise insuperable:” he acknowledged, however, that “nothing was, anciently, more usual with all the churches of God, than, when times and necessity required it, to *change* the laws made by themselves, to abrogate old ones, and substitute others and perhaps different ones in their stead. This could not be unknown to any one who is

* Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 200.

“versed in ecclesiastical history.”* On the 25th of November the new prolocutor was presented to the Bishop of London, whose chaplain he had been, for his lordship’s approbation. According to custom he addressed the assembly in a Latin speech. He extolled the excellence of the Church of England as established by law, above all other national establishments; intimated that it wanted no amendment; and, with an air of triumph, concluded in the language of the English Barons on a different occasion, “*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari* ;†” expressive of a determination not to consent to any change of the English laws. The bishop in his answer, delivered

* Candid Disquisitions, p. 282, note 18, 2d edit.

† This famous answer, Bishop Warburton observes, has been quoted a thousand and a thousand times; and yet no body seems to have understood the policy and management from which it arose, and which it at first implied. It originated with a Bill brought into Parliament in the reign of Henry II. by the bishops, who, as partisans of the Pope, wished to subject England to the imperial and papal laws. The castles of the barons, under the Norman and Plantagenet races, were full of bastards; so that the very name was honourable. The bishops to meet this state of things, and to draw the barons into their views, with an air of great courtesy and consideration for the situation of their descendants, proposed it to Parliament to pass an Act, which should legalize children born before marriage. The barons penetrated into the design of the measure, and answered with one voice, “*Quod nolumus leges Angliæ mutari* :” rejecting a proposition most agreeable to them, from fear of the consequences, the introduction of the imperial laws, whose very genius and essence was arbitrary, despotic power. Their answer shews it, “*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari* ;” they had nothing to object to the reform, but they were afraid for the constitution. Letters of a late eminent Prelate, p. 199, 8vo. edit.

also in Latin, affected, though he had been a party in the intrigues to which Dr. Jane owed his election, a conciliatory tone. He exhorted the clergy to exercise and promote a temper of kindness and moderation in things not essential to salvation, and to open the door of salvation to a multitude of straying Christians. He told them, “that it must needs be their duty to shew the same indulgence and charity to dissenters under King William, which some of the bishops and clergy had promised to them in their addresses to King James.” He closed his speech, with the words of Joseph to his brethren, “*Ne tumultuamini in consiliis vestris,*” admonishing them to preserve unanimity and concord in their proceedings.

At the next meeting the bishop informed the convocation, that the royal commission, by which they were empowered to act, had been discovered to be defective by an eminent civilian to whom he had communicated it, because the great seal was not affixed to it: for which reason, he should prorogue them, till that royal attestation was procured. On the 4th of December, when both houses were convened in Henry VIIth’s chapel, the commission dated the 30th of November, and having the great seal annexed to it, was delivered by the Earl of Nottingham, who had always signalized himself by his active exertions on behalf of the church. It was accompanied with a message from the King, assuring the convocation of his invariable favour and protection; “That his Majesty had summoned it, not only

“ because it was usual upon holding a Parliament,
“ but out of a pious zeal to do every thing that
“ might tend to the establishment of the Church
“ of England, which was so eminent a part of
“ the reformed church, and best suited the con-
“ stitution of this government : that he’doubted not
“ but that they would assist him in promoting its
“ welfare, so that no prejudices with which some
“ might labour to possess them, should disappoint
“ his good intentions, or deprive the church of
“ any benefit from their consultations. His Majesty
“ expressed his expectations, that the things that
“ should be proposed would be calmly and im-
“ partially considered by them : and he assured them
“ that he would offer nothing to them, but what
“ should be for the honour, peace, and advantage,
“ both of the Protestant religion in general, and of
“ the Church of England in particular.” The Earl
of Nottingham, after he had delivered the King’s
message, addressed the assembly in an eloquent speech,
and recommended it to them to lay aside all partial
prepossessions and animosities in their proceedings.

The bishops withdrew to the Jerusalem chamber,
where they agreed upon an address to his Majesty,
the form of which, with a copy of the royal message,
they sent to the lower house of convocation, de-
siring their concurrence. The purport of the
episcopal address was to thank his Majesty “ for the
“ grace and goodness expressed in his message, and
“ for the zeal shewn in it for the Protestant religion
“ in general, and the Church of England in parti-

“ cular, and for the trust and confidence reposed in
“ the convocation by the commission. They looked
“ upon these marks of his Majesty’s care and favour
“ as the continuance of the great deliverance which
“ ALMIGHTY GOD had wrought by his means,
“ making him the blessed instrument of their pre-
“ servation from the cruelty of popish tyranny. As
“ they had often thanked GOD for this, so they
“ could not forget that high obligation and duty
“ which they owed to his Majesty. On the renewed
“ assurances of his protection and favour to the
“ Church, they begged leave to renew the assurance
“ of their constant fidelity and obedience to his Ma-
“ jesty ; and that in pursuance of the trust and con-
“ fidence he reposed in them, they would consider
“ whatever might be offered to them with calmness
“ and impartiality.”*

The lower house of convocation, on receiving the draught of this address, would not consent to it ; but first pleaded for the privilege of presenting a separate one, drawn up by themselves ; and then waving that claim, proposed amendments in that submitted to them by the bishops ; for they disapproved of the clause in which his Majesty’s “ zeal
“ for the Protestant Religion in general, and the
“ Church of England in particular,” was acknowledged by the addressers with sentiments of applause and gratitude. The lower house construed this as importing some common union with foreign protestants ; whereas, in their judgment, the address in

* Bishop Compton’s Life, p. 55.

return to his Majesty's message should be exclusively confined to points that concerned the Church of England. On this principle, if they were not permitted to draw up a new form of their own, they were very zealous for an amendment of that clause.

With a view to adjust these differences, the Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Burnet, from the upper house, and the prolocutor from the lower, were deputed to hold a conference. It was urged by the bishop, in defence of the clause to which objections were made, that as the religious establishment in this country was not distinguished from other protestant churches but by its hierarchy and revenues, the phrase "Church of England" was an equivocal expression; for if popery should again prevail, it would be called the Church of England still. The prolocutor replied, that the Church of England was distinguished by its doctrine, as it stands in the articles, liturgy, and homilies, as well as by its hierarchy: and that the term protestant churches, as the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Quakers, assumed that title, was still more equivocal. It was stated, that the reasons why the bishops insisted on the express mention of the protestant religion, were, 1. Its being in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, the known denomination of the common doctrine of the western part of Christendom. 2. That to leave it out might have ill consequences, and be liable to strange constructions, among protestants as well as papists, both at home and abroad. 3. That it agreed with the general

reason offered by the clergy for their amendments, since this is expressly mentioned in the King's message ; and in this the Church of England was so much concerned, that the bishops thought it ought to stand in the address.

The lower house, after debating these reasons, refused their consent to them ; but agreed to thank his Majesty " for his pious zeal and care for the " honour, peace, advantage, and establishment of " the Church of England : " and then to add, " whereby we doubt not the interest of all the " Protestant Churches, which is dear to us, will " under the influence of your Majesty's government " be the better secured." The upper house desired them to give their reason for inserting " protestant " churches," instead of the " protestant religion." It was given in these words : " We, being the re- " presentatives of a formed established church, do " not think fit to mention the word religion any " farther than as it is the religion of some formed " established church."* The bishops returned the amendment with this alteration : " We doubt " not the interest of the protestant religion, in (*this* " *and*) all other protestant churches which is " dear to us, will be better secured under your " Majesty's government and protection." The lower house, jealous for the honour of the Church

* Some formed established church. This language of the lower house " serves," as the Author of " the Confessional " remarks " to characterise the spirit and piety of these convocation men." He adds, " the word for religion in the Greek Testament is " *θρησκεία*, which is no where appropriated to a formed established

of England, which it was conceived would suffer a diminution, by joining it with foreign protestant churches, and not content to stand even upon a level with them, would have the words (*this and*) omitted.

An Address was agreed to by the upper house of convocation only, and presented to the King in the Banqueting-House at Whitehall, on Thursday the 12th of December, by the Bishop of London, six of his episcopal brethren, and several doctors of divinity. In this address, the thanks which had been recommended by the bishops, for his royal commission, and for the zeal that he had shewn on behalf of the protestant religion, were omitted. It expressed also a cool regard to the protestant churches, without any particular sentiment of tenderness to the dissenters. The King well understood the cause of these omissions. In his answer he said, that he “took this address very kindly from the convocation;

“church.” Paul speaks of *sects* in the Jewish religion, Acts xxv. 3; some of which were just as much *established*, as the Presbyterians and Quakers are in England. James, ch. i. 27, defines “pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father,” in terms which shew, that such religion may be practised and conformed to, where there neither is nor ever was an established church. But this sort of religion, the pious *Convocation* men did not think fit to mention. Their notion of religion, indeed, hath rather a pagan cast “religionem, eam, quæ in METU
“et CÆREMONIA Deorum sit, appellant,” says Cicero. But another pagan seems to have had a more evangelic idea of religion. “RELIGIOSUS est non modo Deorum sanctitatem magni
“æstimans, sed etiam officiosus adversus homines.” *Festus*, in verbo RELIGIOSUS.

“The Confessional.” Preface to the first edition, p. 38. Or complete edition of Archdeacon Blackburn’s works, vol. v. p. 89.

“ and that they might depend upon it, that he would
“ do all he had promised, and all he could do for
“ the service of the Church of England; and he
“ wished them to consider this as a new assurance
“ that he would improve all occasions and op-
“ portunities for its service.”

By this time the dispositions of the lower house were fully ascertained, and a great majority gave unequivocal evidence that they were against allowing any alterations or amendments in the liturgy, which was the next subject to be considered :* And as the president and his brethren of the episcopal bench thought that it would answer no valuable purpose to communicate any proposals to them on that head, the convocation was adjourned from the 13th of December to the 24th of January, after it had sat ten days without advancing one step in the business for which its members were called together. It was at last dissolved with the Parliament.†

“ There was at this time,” says Bishop Burnet,
“ but a small number of bishops in the upper house
“ of convocation, and they had not their metropo-
“ litan with them, so they had not strength and
“ authority to set things forward; therefore they
“ advised the King to suffer the session to be dis-

* “ In what a contemptible light,” observes Dr. Furneaux,
“ does that majority in convocation appear, who would not so much
“ as hear what was prepared for their consideration, by *such cele-*
“ *brated divines*, the glory of the English church, acting under a
“ royal commission.” Letters to Blackstone, p. 83, note.

† Calamy, vol. i. p. 461—464; Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 202—207.

“ continued: and seeing they were in no disposition
 “ to enter upon business, they were kept from doing
 “ mischief by prorogations for the course of ten
 “ years. This was in reality a favour to them. For
 “ ever since the year 1662 the convocation had
 “ indeed continued to sit, but to do no business: so
 “ that they were kept at no small charge in town,
 “ but only to meet and read a latin liturgy; and
 “ consequently, it was an ease to be freed from such
 “ an attendance for no purpose. But the ill recep-
 “ tion the clergy gave the King’s message raised
 “ a great clamour against them, since all the promises
 “ made in King James Ild’s time were now so
 “ entirely forgotten.”*

By the disagreement between the two houses of
 convocation, on the business of the royal commission,
 was laid the foundation of the differences that after-
 wards rose to a great height, subsisted through many
 years, and broke out, on different occasions, to the
 injury of religion, while they brought on the clergy
 censure and contempt. In the instance before us,
 the pacific wishes of the king were thwarted, his
 liberal attempts proved abortive, an opportunity of
 conciliating, at least many of the dissenters, and of
 improving the worship and devotional services of the
 Church of England, was lost: and a design, of which
 Archbishop Wake, when he was bishop of Lincoln,
 declared in the House of Lords, he was “ persuaded
 “ it would have been for the *interest* and peace of

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 47—48.

“ the *Church* and State, had it been accomplished,”* has not to this day been resumed. The unsuccessfulness of the proposals for a comprehension was ascribed, in part, to the Presbyterians. At the time when these conciliatory measures were depending, sacred orders, agreeable to the Presbyterian form, were given to fifty young students: and Mr. Baxter was charged with reflecting on the Church of England, in a book which he then published.† It should be confessed, that these instances of conduct, if they be fairly stated, were not seasonable and cautious; and might displease, if not exasperate, those who were unfriendly to the scheme of a comprehension. But the fact was, that a jealousy and distrust, not to be conquered, had taken hold of the inferior clergy: and the adherents to James II. who wished and hoped that the proposed alterations would pass, that they might be furnished with objections against the new models of worship, and with grounds for making a schism in the Church, in the warmth and precipitancy of their tempers, raised such a clamour against them, as prevented their being adopted.‡ It was thought dangerous even by the friends of the alterations to make any change, at this juncture, that might give pretence to those who did not own the existing government to declare themselves adherents to the old church as well as the old king.||

* Hints, p. 28. § Life of Bishop Compton, p. 57.

† Burnet, vol. iv. p. 48.

|| Calamy, vol. i. p. 464.

In a word, great was the collision of parties at that time, and delicate and intricate was the state of affairs both in church and state. “It appeared in many visible instances,” says Bishop Burnet,” that our wounds were then too tender to be either handled or healed ; so that it was thought fit to let the matter sleep, and to give no new occasion to heat and animosity. But at the same time to keep the clergy still ready upon call, if there should be any occasion for them during the sessions of Parliament; yet not to charge them with a needless attendance, when the public occasions put them under so many taxes: it being also observed, that in a hot time all unnecessary assemblies are to be avoided; for if they have no business one way, they commonly make it another.”*

Thus terminated the seventh attempt to reform the Church of England, by consulting the scruples and objections of those who were dissatisfied with many things in its services. The first was the Hampton-Court conference, in the reign of James I. Bishop Usher’s scheme for the reduction of episcopacy was a second measure of this kind, in the time of Charles I. After the restoration of Charles II. proposals for a comprehension were four times brought forward. This under William III. was the seventh. Ever since the affair has laid dormant. These designs have always proceeded on a principle not to be admitted by one who understands the rights of conscience and the nature of Christian liberty;

* As quoted in Calamy, vol. i. p. 465.

this principle is the doctrine of *imposition*. Had these attempts been successful, they could have had a temporary effect only: for as the Scriptures are more critically and judiciously studied; as the minds of men by improvements in science and knowledge are expanded; as free enquiry investigates and discovers existing corruptions in the profession of Christianity; and as human creeds and established forms of religion are examined by sound reason, and brought to the sacred standard of divine revelation; new grounds of dissatisfaction with the received forms and credenda have arisen; new reasons of dissent have presented themselves to a reflecting mind; and errors in faith and worship, which had lain concealed for ages, or had been under the sanction of time received and tenaciously retained as undisputed truths, have come to light. This has been the fact; and experience shews, that as the human mind exerts its powers in free, impartial enquiry, and becomes enlightened, it gains vigour and resolution to avow its convictions, and to act up to them. The alterations which would satisfy the limited views of one age, do by no means come up to the more discerning penetration and the more enlarged ideas of a subsequent period. When the matter is considered in this light, we have less reason to regret that these past attempts to conciliate and unite the different religious parties proved abortive. We may, however, with pleasure reflect that they were not wholly in vain. They awakened attention; they cast light on the questions discussed; they discovered characters;

they exercised candour; in some instances called forth a spirit of liberality; and united some worthy persons in mutual good opinion and in friendship, whom they failed to bring under the bonds of the same outward profession. The memorials of these attempts, be it added, constitute no unprofitable documents of instruction and admonition to future times. The records of the proceedings, on these attempts, remain not only to furnish information concerning the state of opinions and parties in past ages, but to afford rules of conduct on future occasions, and to give a sanction to new measures of reforming and uniting the different religious parties, and of simplifying and purifying their creeds and rituals. This has in reality been the eventual effect of King William's commission, at the distance of nearly 100 years. The Episcopal Church of America, at a convention of its members from the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, holden at Philadelphia from Sept. 27th to Oct. 7th, 1785, in a revival of the English liturgy, adopted the alterations of the Book of Common Prayer, which had been proposed by the commissioners under King William in 1689.* Though the immediate purpose of the royal commission miscarried, the effort has not been lost.

As to England; "here," in the failure of the commission, "hath *Terminus*," as the author of "the Confessional" expresses it, "fixed his pedestal, and here hath he kept his station for two

* Brewster's Secular Essays, p. 298.

“ whole centuries. We are just where the Act of
“ Uniformity left us, and where, for aught that appears
“ in the temper of the times, the last trumpet will
“ find us.” § Previously to the proroguing of the
convocation some matters were brought forward,
by which, besides the avowed object to be obtained,
it was designed to interest the public mind in other
questions, and to divert the proceedings of the
meeting from the point which they were summoned
to consider. With this view, on the 11th of
December the prolocutor attended the president and
bishops, and in the name of the lower house, re-
presented to their lordships, that “ several books
“ of very dangerous consequence to the Christian
“ religion and the Church of England had been re-
“ cently published;” and desired their lordships’
advice, “ in what way and how far, without incur-
“ ring the penalty of 25th of Henry VIII., the
“ convocation might proceed in preventing the pub-
“ lication of the like scandalous books for the future;
“ and inflicting the censures of the church, according
“ to the canons provided in that behalf, upon the
“ authors of them.”

One of the productions against which this request
was pointed, was a sheet of paper entitled “ Notes
“ upon the Creed of Athanasius;” which had met
with the candid reception and approbation of some
learned men, both in London and other places.
They had, it appears, excited great attention; and Dr.

§ The Preface to the first edition, p. 31; or Blackburne’s Works,
vol. v. p. 90.

Sherlock thought fit to oppose to them a large book, as “a Vindication of the Trinity and Incarnation.” They fell also under the animadversion of two other writers, Mr Savage and Mr. Marlow. In the year 1690 they were republished in a quarto pamphlet, accompanied with an historical view of “The Acts of Great Athanasius, and Observations on Dr. Sherlock’s Treatise.”

Another tract, on which it was the design of the lower house of convocation to fix a censure was, “a Letter to a Friend relating to the present convocation at Westminster,” by Dr. Prideaux. This was intended as an answer to several pamphlets from the pens of those who were hostile to any alterations. It met with such warm approbation, that an impression of several thousands was sold within a fortnight after its first publication. Though it appeared without a name, the author was discovered, and the rapid and extensive sale of it so exasperated the other party, that they were ready to make him the immediate object of their censures. But it was urged that they ought to begin with the pamphlets which were first published: so just and reasonable a proposal could not be rejected. This measure of, the prolocutor, it was also alleged, was an interference with the business of the convocation; it made an appeal to the public on points which already were referred to the extraordinary commission, and was an attempt to prejudice a cause before it was authoritatively heard. To evade the objections, the whole affair was dropped; and they permitted the adversary, as every advo-

cate for alterations was conceived to be, to escape unpunished, rather than that their friends should be exposed to the same censure. The prolocutor, however, on the 13th of December, reported to the house, "that the president had declared his sense
" of the ill consequences of those books which had
" been sent up to their lordships from the lower
" house; that, upon enquiry, he could not receive
" any satisfaction, how far the convocation might
" proceed in that affair; but that he would, as far as
" lay in him, take further order about it."* Here the matter concluded.

Another affair, besides the main object of the royal commission, pressed, at this time, with great weight on the minds of the clergy in the convocation; and served to divert the attention of men from the discussion of questions concerning alterations in ecclesiastical matters. This was the situation of the bishops and clergy who were under a suspension for refusing to take the oaths to the new government. One of the members of the lower house, from a reserved kindness for them, in a warm and zealous speech proposed that "something might be done to qualify
" them to sit in convocation, so that the convocation
" might not incur any danger thereby." But this matter, after it was suggested, was felt to be of too delicate a nature to be pursued, and was therefore left to farther consideration.||

* Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 207, 208. Prideaux's Life, p. 57, 58. A Collection of Unitarian Tracts, 4to. 169.

|| Dr. Compton's Life, p. 56.

The first day of the preceding March had been appointed for taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to King William. Eight bishops, and, encouraged by their example, many individuals of the inferior clergy, under the idea that it was repugnant to the allegiance which they had sworn to their late sovereign, refused to take the oaths, and sacrificed their benefices with a laudable integrity to scruples of conscience; for in consequence of their refusal they were suspended from the exercise of their sacred functions, and from the enjoyment of their preferments. They were distinguished by the name of nonjurors. The bishops so denominated were Sancroft, of Canterbury; Turner, of Ely; Lake, of Chichester; Kenn, of Bath and Wells; White, of Peterborough; Lloyd, of Norwich; Thomas, of Worcester; and Frampton, of Gloucester. The five first of these were of the number of the seven bishops sent to the Tower by King James, for refusing to promulgate the declaration of indulgence. “Thus
“ a second time, and within a very short interval,” observes a very respectable author, “sacrificing,
“ though in an ignoble and unworthy cause, their
“ interest to their sincerity and integrity.”* The vacant sees of the recusant prelates were not filled up for more than a year. Thomas and Lake did not long survive their suspension. The latter, on being seized with a dangerous distemper, signed a solemn declaration, in which he avowed it to have been his determination not to take the oath, though

* Belsham's History from the Revolution to the Hanoverian Succession, vol. i. p. 115.

the penalty had been loss of life; and professed his adherence to the doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience, which he regarded as the distinguishing characteristics of the Church of England. After his death this paper was published, industriously circulated, and extolled by the party as an inspired oracle, pronounced by a martyr to religious truth and sincerity.* Kenn, whose publications, the genuine effusions of his heart, had a very practical tendency, lived after his deprivation with Lord Weymouth at Longleat. At the death-bed of King Charles II. when he attended on him, Bishop Burnet reports, that “Kenn spoke with a great elevation of thought and expression, like a man inspired.”† He had been in early life chaplain in the court of the Prince of Orange; and on his landing, declared heartily for him, and zealously urged others to join him. But at the debates in the convention he warmly adopted the notion of a Prince Regent. Though he refused the oaths himself, he persuaded the clergy to take them; and wrote a paper with that design, which Dr. Whitby saw and read. He even went to London with a design to take them; but after he arrived in town, was induced to change his mind, and ever after continued in a warm opposition to the government.‡ He died 19th March, 1710—11.§ The

* Granger's Biographical History of England, vol. iv. p. 291, 2.

† Burnet, vol. ii. p. 459.

‡ Burnet, vol. iv. p. 9. Granger's Biographical History of England, vol. iv. p. 290.

§ There are two anecdotes related concerning Dr. Kenn, which shew the purity of his mind, the decorum of character he had sup-

death of Dr. Thomas, on the 25th June 1689, aged 76, prevented his being deprived of his see, though he had been suspended. Dr. Frampton, in the earlier part of his life chaplain to the factory at Aleppo, retired after his deprivation to the village of Standish, near Gloucester; where he died on the 25th of May 1708, in the 86th year of his age. Dr. Lloyd, a scholar of St. John the Evangelist's college in Cambridge, resided for some years at Lisbon as chaplain to the factory; in which post he conducted himself with singular prudence and integrity towards the papists. The most honourable testimonials had recommended him, in 1675, to the see of Landaff; from which he was translated to Peterborough in 1680, and to Norwich in 1685. After he was deprived, he removed to London, and died in the vicinity of that city on the 1st of January 1709. He left his library, in which were printed books and manuscripts of great value, to the college in which he was educated. The diocese of Norwich, when he was deprived, lost a very able and worthy pastor, a man of great integrity and piety, who had just and comprehensive views of the duties of his function;

ported, and an independence of spirit not to be corrupted by the influence of rank and station. When he resided in the court of the Prince of Orange, he obliged one of his Highness's favourites to perform his contract, by marrying a young lady of the Princess's train whom he had seduced by that contract. When he was chaplain to Charles II. and the court was at Winchester, he peremptorily refused to admit the royal mistress, Nell Gwynn, into his apartments. The Stateholder, in the former case, was highly offended; but the King, so far from resenting his religious intrepidity, soon after made him a bishop. Granger, vol. iv. p. 290, *note*.

and whose mind was bent to fulfil them on all occasions to the benefit of his church, and the honour of God.* Dr. White, after the loss of his bishopric, lived in retirement, and died on the 30th of May 1698. Dr. Turner, the intimate friend of the pious Bishop Kenn, had enjoyed the peculiar friendship and patronage of the late absconded king, when he was Duke of York, by whom he was preferred to the deanery of Windsor, which he afterwards held with the bishopric of Rochester; from which he was translated to the see of Ely, on the 23d of August 1684. After he was deprived, he engaged in a correspondence with the queen of the exiled king; at St. Germain's; and entered on measures with the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Preston, and his brother Mr. Graham, for restoring King James to the throne, whilst King William was absent at a congress of princes at the Hague. § The design was discovered;

* Dr. Prideaux's Life, p. 73.

§ Bishop Burnet adds the name of WILLIAM PENN, the famous Quaker, to those who were engaged in this design. But his late liberal and intelligent biographer has fully vindicated the character of this great man from the misrepresentation; who, though his name was inserted in a proclamation, on suspicion of having been concerned in the design, made it appear to the King and Council in 1693, that he never was a party in this or any other attempt of this nature. The immediate effect of which was his acquittal from the charge brought against him. Valuable and fair an historian as in general is the bishop, in this instance his statement was inaccurate; and his mind was warped by prejudice conceived against Mr. Penn when they were both at the Hague. The error stands on record as a lesson of caution to future writers; but it is to be the more regretted, as subsequent historians have copied from Burnet, and omitted to mention Mr. Penn's acquittal.—See Clarkson's Life of Penn, vol. ii. p. 377.

some of the party were apprehended and imprisoned. Dr. Turner absconded. He died at Therfield in Hertfordshire, on Nov. 2, 1700.¶ A vindication of the conduct of himself, and of the deprived prelates, in rejecting the oaths, came, with other publications, from his pen.

The person to whom the prelates, who were fellow sufferers with him, looked up with great deference and respect, was Archbishop Sancroft. He attracted their regards by his unblemished morals and great learning; commanded their attention by his exalted rank; and encouraged their imitation by his own example of fortitude on this occasion, and by his refusing to read the declaration for liberty of conscience. In other instances he had shewn himself timid and irresolute, fluctuating between an attachment to the late king and allegiance to the new; not uniformly consistent in his support of the one, nor absolutely discarding the interests of the other. “ Though he had joined the other peers and
“ privy counsellors in inviting the Prince of Orange
“ to take the administration of the government upon
“ him, he refused to pay his compliments of congratulation at St. James’s on his safe arrival. When
“ the convention met, he came not to take his place
“ among them, resolving to act neither for nor against
“ the interests of King James; and though he himself refused the oaths, he cautiously avoided taking
“ any steps, by acting or speaking, to deter others

¶ Granger, vol. iv. p. 289. Burnet, vol. iv. p. 100; and Godwin de Præsulibus, curâ Richardson, p. 277.

“from such compliance.”* After his deprivation he lived in retirement at Fressingfield, in the county of Suffolk, where he was born, and where he died on the 24th of November 1693, aged 76. He is said in his retirement to have cultivated his garden with his own hand; enjoying, though with the sacrifice of greatness and splendour, the peace of conscious rectitude. In leaving Lambeth, he first withdrew to a private house in town. Thomas earl of Aylesbury paid him a visit there: the prelate received him at the door of his apartment, which he himself opened. The Earl, struck with this circumstance of humiliation, and the total change of the scene in which he had frequently beheld him at his palace, burst into tears. As soon as he recovered the power of speech, he told him how deeply he was affected with what he saw; and of his inability to suppress his grief. “Oh, my good lord,” replied the prelate, “rather rejoice with me, for now I live again.”†

The integrity of these prelates in refusing the oaths to the new government, under the idea that to take them would be a violation of their former oaths, how erroneous soever we may think their views to have been, reflects honour on their names. It was a generous and magnanimous sacrifice of rank, influence, and wealth, to conscientious scruples. The religious reverence due to an oath was strengthened, in their case, by a habit of attachment, from education and principle, to the royal family of the Stuarts, and by their tenacious adherence to the

* Bellham, vol. i. p. 115. † Granger, vol. iv. p. 281.

doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. They felt also their obligations to the royal house, to which they owed their high preferments. Their situation brought them into a peculiar difficulty with respect to the clergy who applied to them for institution. They could not grant it without tendering the oaths, which they themselves thought unlawful. Previously to the year 1660, the Chancellors of a diocese had been invested with a power, in the absence of the Bishop, to give institution: but by a general agreement, in that year, the bishops determined to except this power out of the patents which they gave to their chancellors. The obligation to see that the clergy, before they gave them institution, took the oaths to government, rested, by this exception, solely with the bishops; who, if they did not admit the clerks presented to them, were liable to the actions of *quare impedit*. Under this perplexity, to avoid at once such actions and yet wave enacting the oaths, they granted new patents to their chancellors, empowering them to give institution. “So they invested laymen with authority to admit clergymen to benefices, and to do that which they thought unlawful, as was the swearing to an usurper against the lawful king. Thus it appeared,” says Burnet, “how far the engagements of interest and parties can run men into contradictions.”* In the survey of human actions and conduct, what frequent occasions have we to observe and lament the failure of firmness, and deviations

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 9, 10.

from consistency, in characters on the whole respectable for integrity and independence!

The deprived bishops were permitted to continue at their sees above a year; and no nomination was made of others to their ecclesiastical posts. They lived during this space privately in their palaces, and performed no episcopal function, and took no part in the concerns of the church. Bishop Burnet, by the Queen's order, engaged Sir John Trevor and the Earl of Rochester, who had great influence with the prelates, to try whether they would renew their functions, in ordinations, institutions, and confirmations, and assist at public worship, as formerly, should an Act be obtained to excuse their taking the oaths. When an attempt was made to ascertain their sentiments on these points, they would give no other answer than that they would live quietly. By this reply it was understood that their intention was to keep themselves close, till the proper time should encourage them to act more openly. || This was an indication, that however a conscientious scruple might at first have determined them to refuse the oaths, an attachment to the abdicated family had a firm hold on their minds, and that they cherished the hope of an opportunity to express again their allegiance to it. All thoughts of engaging them to resume their episcopal functions were on this laid aside: and it was determined to fill the sees which had been vacated by deprivation. The detection of the plot which we have already

|| Burnet, vol. iv. p. 103.

mentioned, and the Bishop of Ely's letters to St. Germans, afforded a fair occasion, and furnished a justification for executing this purpose.

It was judged a matter of the first importance that the see of Canterbury should be well filled. The effects of the other nominations would depend upon this, and they would all take their complexion from it. This would explain the views of the new king; and the nation would learn from the nature of it, whether he would continue to pursue moderate and healing measures, or would fall in with the passions and humours of a high party, that seemed to court him as abjectly as they inwardly hated him. In this critical moment, the King and Queen, from a deservedly high opinion of the Dean of St. Paul's, grounded on an experience of his zeal for their interest, and of his mild and prudent counsels for two years, directed their thoughts to Dr. Tillotson, the intimate friend of Dr. Burnet, a man of large principles, free from superstition, and an enemy to violence and severities; a man whose zeal had been directed against atheism and popery; but had never expressed itself in sharpness and bitterness towards the Dissenters, with many of whom he had lived in good correspondence, and several of whom, by the softness of persuasion and arguments only, he had been the means of bringing over to the Church. As this amiable divine had no ambition in his temper, and he foresaw to what a scene of trouble and slander this high station would expose him in the decline of life; especially as the successor to one

who was called a confessor, and was the object of public compassion; he resisted the wishes and importunities of his royal friends to accept the post, for above a year. At length, with great uneasiness to himself, he submitted to the King's command. The see of York soon after falling vacant, Dr. Sharp, an excellent preacher, but who was not steady as Tillotson, nor had an equal knowledge of the world, was promoted to it. Dr. Patrick was advanced to the see of Ely; Dr. More was made bishop of Norwich; Dr. Fowler was promoted to the see of Gloucester; the see of Hereford was given to Dr. Ironside; that of Chichester was bestowed on Dr. Grove; and that of Bristol was assigned to Dr. Hall; and Dr. Hough, president of Magdalen College, had, the year before this, been placed in the episcopal seat of Oxford. "So that in two years," observes Bishop Burnet, "the King had named fifteen bishops; and they were generally looked on as the most learned, the wisest, and best men that were in the church. It was visible, that in all these nominations, and in filling the inferior dignities that became void by their promotion, no ambition nor court favour had appeared; men were not scrambling for preferment, nor using arts or employing friends to set them forward; on the contrary, men were sought for and brought out of their retirements, and most of them very much against their own inclinations. They were men both of moderate principles, and of calm tempers. These promotions were such a disco-

“ very of the King and Queen’s designs with relation,
“ to the church, that it served to much remove the
“ jealousies that some other steps the King had made,
“ were beginning to raise in the minds of the whigs,
“ and very much softened the ill-humour that was
“ spread among them.*”

Not only the bishops whom we have mentioned refused the oaths to the new government; but many amongst the inferior clergy, from the same attachment to King James, from similar ideas of the permanent obligation of the oaths by which they had pledged their allegiance to him, without allowing for that obligation being set aside by the king’s breach of his coronation engagements, and from the encouragement and stimulus afforded by the example of the prelates, likewise pursued the same line of conduct. A bill was brought into the House of Commons, by which all persons were required, under several forfeitures and penalties, to take the oaths by a fixed day. The clergy who should not comply with the requisition, were to fall under suspension for six months; and at the end of that time, on persisting in the refusal, they were to be deprived. An attempt was made in the House of Lords to modify this bill. Bishop Burnet took an active part in favour of the clergy. Its object was, that instead of the clause positively enacting that they should be obliged to take the oaths, the king might be empowered to tender them, and then the refusal should incur the penalties stated in the Act. It was thought that such

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 110, 111.

a power would be a restraint upon their conduct, and secure their quiet and peaceable deportment; whereas deprivation, and even the apprehension of it, would create resentment, and irritate their minds, in a fit of desperation, to undermine the government. It was argued, that no oaths could bring them under more serious engagements than did the acts of religious worship officially performed by them in the church, which were a solemn avowal of their allegiance to God in the face of the people; that if they should neglect those offices, or perform them in a manner different from what the law prescribed; they were amenable to the Act of Uniformity. Oaths, it was urged, when a government came to need strength from them, had proved an inefficient security; and the obligation of them had been evaded by nice distinctions and subtle interpretations. It was pleaded on the other hand, that the proposed expedient would put a hardship upon the king, a measure to be carefully avoided: That no man, especially in so sacred a concern as religion, who would not give the security of an oath, expressed in such low and general terms, ought to be trusted by a government: That the distance of six months allowed sufficient time to study the point; and they who could not in that space satisfy themselves on the lawfulness of acknowledging the government, were not fit to be continued in the highest posts in the church. It further was proposed to allow an exception of twelve clergymen, who should be subject to the law on refusing the oaths, at the requisition of the king. But

the only mitigation that could be obtained, was a power to the king to reserve a third part of the profits of any twelve benefices which he should name, to the incumbents deprived under this Act.* Thus the Bill passed.

By the operation of this Act, the clergy were thrown into two divisions ; one, which included a great majority, took the oaths ; the other, the minority, who refused them. Among the latter were *Henry Dodwell*, distinguished by his learning and great zeal to exalt the powers and dignity of the priesthood ; and who, in consequence of his refusal, was deprived of the Camdenian professorship of history in the University of Oxford : *Dr. George Hicks*, eminent for his extensive erudition and knowledge in antiquities, who lost the deanery of Worcester, and the rectory of All-Church in that city : and *Dr. William Sherlock*, to whose name various controversial and practical writings have given a celebrity ; and whose refusal, as he afterwards submitted to the requisition of the Act, subjected him to a temporary suspension only from his preferments, and the mastership of the Temple ; afterwards, when King James fled from Ireland, on the principle that this step gave the new government a thorough settlement, he thought it lawful to take the oaths ; and followed up the change of his opinion by a compliance with the Act that proposed them. This provoked the resentment and chagrin of the nonjurors, especially as his refusal had been long and pertinacious, and

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 12, 13.

he was severely libelled for it. He published a vindication of his conduct, to ward off the force of their censures. This instance of retraction and political conformity was, on the other hand, “a great triumph to the Court; and he was immediately rewarded, for what one party stiled his happy conversion, and the other his faithless apostacy, by the acquisition of the rich deanery of St. Paul’s.”*

Among the majority who took the oaths, there was a difference of principle. Some acted from a conviction of the lawfulness of the oaths; on a liberal regard to the constitution of the nation, and the important interests to be secured by allegiance to the new government, and on the consideration of King James having forfeited, by his unlawful measures, the allegiance of his subjects. But the greatest part of those who complied with the requisition of the oaths, appeared, by the distinctions and reservations with which they did it, to have acted with doubtful minds, if not in the direct violation of the dictates of conscience. They reconciled their consciences to it, though they had been warm advocates for the doctrines of non-resistance and passive obedience, by declaring that they took the oaths in no other sense, than that of a peaceable submission to the powers that were. They pleaded, that the legislature, by dropping the word “rightful,” in the form of the oath, allowed the distinction between a king *de facto*, and a king *de jure*; and they availed themselves of this distinction. It was a maxim with them, that if prudence obliged them to conform to the letter of the oath, so

* Belsham, vol. i. p. 213.

conscience required them to give it their own interpretation. "Nothing could be more infamous or of worse tendency," observes a modern historian, "than this practice of equivocating in the most sacred of all obligations. It introduced a general disregard of oaths, which has been the source of universal perjury and corruption."* The ways, by which it is well known the force and obligation of oaths are evaded, should admonish legislators not without the utmost reason to enjoin them, and to enjoin them on the fewest occasions possible. Promisory oaths as to duty seem to be wholly unnecessary in all cases, where the violation of duty is an overt act, that is open to notice and amenable to law.

Among those persons who in the case before us were dissatisfied with the oaths and refused to take them, some continued to preach even after the time had elapsed that was fixed by the Act of Parliament for their compliance, and such individuals were legally silenced. By this conduct they followed the steps of the ejected ministers, who persevered in their official duties after Bartholomew day; and whom they had on this ground censured with severity, and charged with great guilt. The generality of those who persevered in their refusal, at length quitted their preferments, refused to hold communication with such persons as had taken the oaths to the new government, and formed a new separation from the establishment. A congregation formed on the principles of the nonjurors, which

* Smollet, vol. i. p. 68.

held its religious meetings at the Coffee-House in Aldersgate-street, existed later than the year 1750. The name of their minister was Lindsay, a clergyman episcopally ordained.

This state of parties gave birth to a new, and, in several views, a remarkable contest. The non-juring clergy accused such as had yielded to the government with betraying their consciences for great preferments, and reproached them as “a pack of jolly swearers.” These, on the other hand, upbraided the nonjurors as schismatics, who had fallen into the same crime which they had condemned in others. It was pleaded by the nonjurors, that their secession was not voluntary, but forced by penalties, which were to them, as ministers, conditions of communion ; and by sanctions of so severe and fatal a nature, annexed to the requisition of the oaths, as to warrant a separation : That a clergyman’s authority, whether a bishop or a priest, was from God ; of which he was bound, at any hazard, to take care, and to perform its duties, notwithstanding any civil act to prohibit and disable him, under a solemn apprehension of the account he has to give ; and, That no parliamentary deprivation could set aside the obligations of bishops, not deposed by ecclesiastical censures, to superintend their churches, or the obligation of their churches to live in subjection to them. This plea they applied particularly to Archbishop Sancroft, though he never asserted his right after his deprivation, and might therefore be justly considered as surrendering it,

To these arguments it was replied : That the first plea was uniting with dissenters to complain of unjust and severe penalties : That on the ground of it there was always warrant for separatists and nonjurors : That if admitted, it applied to them as ministers only, and left them at liberty as laymen to join the communion of the church : That the condition of taking the oaths required of the ministers was nothing to the people, who could not unite with them without being guilty of a notorious schism : and, That granting they were grieved by the secular power, and deprived of their subsistence as well as emoluments by an Act of Parliament, they ought not to revenge the injury on the church. It was answered to the second plea, that though the civil magistrate could not give or take away the intrinsic power of the word and sacraments, conferred with the keys of ordination; yet he could bestow, or, if the case required it, take away again, in his own dominions, the extrinsecal power and licence of exercising the ministerial office, received by ordination : and to such a lawful deprivation the clerk was bound to submit. The nonjurors were reminded, that the time had been, when this doctrine was held to be true against the dissenters, whom therefore they had regarded as schismatics ; and that, on this principle, they themselves incurred the same charge. It was urged against the third plea, that it did not appear how the churches were obliged to follow their ecclesiastical guides into schism : and that if there were any weight in it, the clergy in the provinces and

dioceses in which the metropolitan or bishop took the oaths, were obliged to adhere to them, and to separate themselves from those who opposed their authority. “When,” it was asked, “did Christians “in ancient times ever refuse communion with a “church on account of matters of state ; or divide “from others, because they, from whom they “divided, thought it lawful and their duty to swear “allegiance to the sovereign power?”

From the time of the restoration of King Charles II, two favourite principles had been strenuously advanced by the prelatical party ; namely, “the “power of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters, “and passive obedience without any limitations.” Now a singular inversion in opinion and arguing arose from the change of circumstances. These principles were opposed even by persons who had been strenuous advocates for them. They who deserted King James, and joined the standard of the Prince of Orange, violated the principle of unlimited passive obedience : for which they were keenly upbraided by their brethren the nonjurors. They who fell under the displeasure of the government, no longer owned the power of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters ; but set up the claim of an inherent right in the church : and some of them went so far as the kirk of Scotland to borrow new principles. They who were on the other side, did not fail to cast reflections on them for this conduct. The high party, to defend themselves from the charge of schism, adopted the pleas of the dissenters,

for whom they had formerly the least charity. The moderate and the adherents to King William found it a hard task to vindicate their change of notions and schemes of government against the ill-natured and bitter insults of the other party. In this collision of sentiments among the members of the established church, the dissenters kept their ground, and adhered to the principles on which they had all along acted. They were sincere and cordial in their attachment to the new government. They received and improved the day of liberty with gratitude. Though they could not obtain such alterations in the ceremonies, worship, and discipline of the church, as would pave the way to a coalition; yet they conducted themselves with more respect both to civil and ecclesiastical powers, than was manifested by those who had formerly valued themselves on their submissiveness. From this time, as the favourable moment was past without any thing having been effected, they had no expectation of being amused and deluded with new proposals of alterations and amendments; and they were fully convinced, that nothing but a peculiar providence or some signal event would satisfy those of the necessity of a coalition, who had been averse from improving two such excellent opportunities to accomplish it, as the restoration of Charles II. and the recent Revolution *

The time was now come for the Dissenting Ministers to place themselves under the full protection

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 465—469.

of the Act of Toleration, by a compliance with the condition it required. This was a subscription to the doctrinal articles of the Church of England. Mr. Baxter took the lead. Difficulties and doubts, as to the meaning of some of the articles, arose from the obscure and ambiguous phraseology in which they were conveyed. He drew up a statement of his ideas on these equivocal terms, for his own satisfaction, and to answer the scruples of others. The last clause of the second article contained an expression in the Latin, which though left out in the English, occasioned him to demur about the sense. It stated that Christ died to be a sacrifice for all, *omnibus*, the actual sins of men; this Mr. Baxter supposed meant not to include final impenitence, but all sorts of sin that had been forsaken. Christ's descent into hell, in the third article, he explained of the state of separate souls. He felt various objections against the declaration of the third article, that Christ, on his resurrection, "took again his body with flesh and bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, and therewith ascended into heaven." This assertion he understood as signifying that Christ sitteth in heaven with the same body, glorified, rendered spiritual and incorruptible, which on earth had consisted of flesh and bones. In the strict interpretation, the words would be contradictory to 1 Cor. xv. 50, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and give us a degrading idea of his body, as inferior to what his sincere disciples will possess, who are to

rise incorruptible and immortal. He expressed his consent to the sixth article, as containing all things necessary to salvation, if the ministry, sacrament, and church communion came under this description; and if, under the title of canonical books, were included the Epistles of the Hebrews, the 2d of Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John, Jude, and the Revelation. He entered his caveat against the clause in the seventh article, that the civil precepts of the law given from God by Moses ought not to be received in any commonwealth, unless it referred only to the particular civil laws appropriate and peculiar to the Jewish commonwealth; and not to those moral laws, included in the Mosaic institutes, which are of universal obligation, and common to all christian nations. As to the eighth article on the three creeds, he guarded against being understood to admit two Gods by subscribing the clause in the Nicene creed, "God of God, very God of very God;" and made an exception to the damnatory clause of the Athanasian creed. He explained the infection of nature remaining even in the regenerate, according to the ninth article, to be so, not in predominant force or unpardoned, but in a mortified and subdued degree. The language of the tenth article, that "we have no power to do good works," he softened into an acknowledgement that "our natural powers or faculties are not sufficient without grace." That the eleventh article might not be construed as giving any countenance to a disregard of righteousness of life, he was diffuse in

his exposition of it. He shewed a solicitude to be understood as expressing, by the twelfth article, that “good works do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith,” an hypothetical necessity, consistent with freedom; and he expounded the last clause, “that by them,” *i. e.* good works, “a lively faith may be as evidently expressed as a tree discerned by the fruit,” to mean a truth of evidence, not an equal degree. His explanation of the thirteenth article, “of works before justification,” seems to set it aside, by asserting a common grace, preparatory to a special grace; and to contradict it by referring to the texts, which declare, that “to him that hath by improvement shall be given, and in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him;” and by observing, that believing in the being of God, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him, is “better than nothing, than mere sin.” He supposed that the phrase “voluntary works” in the fourteenth article, on works of supererogation, was not designed to stigmatise, as arrogant and impious, voluntary canons, impositions, oaths, and church offices. He gave it as his sense of the sixteenth article, “of sin after baptism,” that it meant only the unpardoned sin against the Holy Ghost, and a total departure from common grace, and some degree of habit and act of some special grace; but that it did not determine the controversy concerning a total and final falling away from such an unconfirmed grace as would otherwise save. On the eighteenth article,

“ of obtaining eternal salvation only by the name
“ of Christ,” he offered some liberal observations ;
namely, that God judgeth men by no other law than
that which they were under : that the Jewish pecu-
liarity did not repeal the gracious law made to
fallen mankind in Adam and Noah : that God had
more people of old than the Jews and profelytes.
On these principles, Mr. Baxter conceived that the
article could not mean to denounce a curse on all
who thought that the spirit and grace of Christ
extended beyond the knowledge of his name, and
who hoped that some who never heard it would be
saved. If it were intended to apply to such, he
boldly and ingenuously declared, he would not
curse them ; adding, all were not accursed that hoped
well of Socrates, Antoninus, Severus, Cicero, Epic-
tetus, Plutarch, and such characters. In his expo-
sition of this article he appealed to the case of the
Jews of old, as having more imperfect notions of
the character of Christ than the Apostles before
his resurrection ; and to the erroneous sentiments
of even the Apostles themselves before that event,
who did not till afterwards believe in the death of
Christ for our sins, in his rising again, in his ascension
and intercession. “ Though faith in these facts is
“ now essential to Christianity ;” yet Mr. Baxter
subjoined, “ if I durst curse all the world, who
“ now believe no more than the ancient Jews and
“ the Apostles then did ; yet I durst not curse all
“ Christians that hope better of them.” He gave
a turn to the twenty-third article, “ of ministering

“ in the congregation,” with an evident design to make it comprehensive of the holy orders of presbyterian ministers. The article itself describes and judges those to be lawfully called to preach and administer the sacraments, “ who are chosen and “ called to this work by men who have public authority given them in the congregation, to call “ and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard:” Our expositor declared he understood public authority to mean “ authority given by Christ in his Scripture “ institution, and by those whom Christ authorises “ under him.” This was a latitude of interpretation beyond the intention of the compilers, who exclusively had in view the authority of bishops. Mr. Baxter was not disposed to subscribe, without explanation, to the twenty-fifth article, on “ the sacraments,” in which they are represented not as “ badges and tokens only of the Christian profession,” but as “ certain sure witnesses and effectual signs “ of grace and of God’s good-will.” The interpretation which he gave of this description of their nature and efficacy, he expressed thus,—that they signify what God offered; invest the true believing receiver in the right of pardon, adoption, and salvation; and are morally operative. He did not pass over the twenty-sixth article, “ on the unworthiness of ministers, which hinders not the “ effect of sacraments,” without subjoining his sentiments on the subject: they were to this purpose; That though the ignorance and wickedness of the

minister doth not make void the sacraments, yet the prayers, preaching, and example of able and godly men are usually more effectual; since “God heareth not sinners,” as the blind man argued, “but if any be a worshipper of Him and doth his will, him He heareth;” and to the wicked God saith, “what hast thou to do to take my covenant into thy mouth?” He observed also on this article, that to prefer a bad man before a better was sin: and that it was dangerous to encourage in daily sin those who, though destitute of the essential qualifications, usurped the sacred office of bishops or pastors. He added this exposition, probably from an apprehension that the article did not sufficiently brand ministers of a wicked character, and left room for superstition to attach virtue and efficacy to the office itself, which, instead of supporting it with purity and dignity, they dishonoured by their vices.

Mr. Baxter concluded the representation of his sentiments on the preceding articles with this declaration: “The excepted articles,” that is, the 34th, 35th, and 36th, and part of the 20th, “and those that need no exposition, I pass by. If I have hit on the true meaning, I subscribe my assent; and I thank God that this national church hath doctrine so sound; and pity them that write, preach, or practise contrary to the articles which they subscribe, and accuse them that refuse subscribing them; and take them for sinners who take them

“ not for their pastors, because that their wickedness
“ nulleth not their sacramental administrations.”*

Mr. Baxter, at the time of subscribing, produced this explication of those articles on which he and many of his brethren felt some difficulties ; that he might testify his disapprobation of the plain literal sense ; and that his views in subscribing might not be mistaken. Fourscore dissenting ministers in London concurred with him in his objections and explications. So far their conduct was explicit, ingenuous, and candid. They acquitted themselves like sincere upright men, who were solicitous not to deceive, or to be misunderstood. But it may be asked, what end was answered by a subscription accompanied with such explanations ? If the explanations expressed only, in other words, the genuine meaning of the articles, and the design of the imposer, there was no occasion for them. If they conveyed a different sense ; subscription, instead of preserving an uniformity of faith and profession, was a cover for a variety of opinions, and for a discordancy of sentiment ; and it becomes difficult to exculpate the subscriber from the charge of equivocation and evasion. Mr. Baxter, indeed, and his brethren, may be considered as honestly declaring their view of the articles on which they had scruples. But admitting that their own private opinions were agreeable to the genuine sense, in complying with the requisition of the Act of Toleration, they lost sight of the great protestant principles,—the sole authority of the Lord Jesus

* Calamy's Abridgement, vol. i. p. 470—476.

Christ as lawgiver of the Christian church, and the perfection and sufficiency of the scriptures; and they bowed to an assumed authority, to claims not of right but of power, to impose explanatory articles of religion. They lost sight of the extent and applications of their own principles, as seceders from a protestant church. Their names, as patterns of consistent protestantism, of religious independence, and of compréhension of mind, cannot stand on equal ground with that of their venerable predecessor John Fox, the martyrologist, who, when summoned to subscribe by the ecclesiastical commissioners of Queen Elizabeth, declined it; and taking his Greek Testament out of his pocket, said, "To this I will subscribe."

When dissenters had by subscription secured the protection and advantages offered by the Act of Toleration, and were become united in harmony and friendship with government, they turned their thoughts to their own internal state. They were divided into various sects; but the two leading and most numerous sects were the Presbyterians and the Independents or congregationalists. The former were at this time in the very zenith of their power. The latter, who first formed a distinct party in 1616, had during the civil wars acquired numbers and respectability, and vied, in point of pre-eminence, with the Episcopalians and Presbyterians. During the administration of Cromwell, their reputation and influence rose to a greater height. But after the restoration of Charles II. they had declined; but

they still subsisted as a distinct body of seceders from the establishment. A coalition of these two parties, on some general principles, was justly deemed desirable, to put an end to uncharitable jealousies and censorious reproaches, and in future to bury their differences in oblivion. Such an union would be honourable to themselves, and conducive to the preservation of the protestant cause. The religious liberty granted and secured by the Act of Toleration was favourable to it; and the minds of ministers and people in the metropolis and in other places were disposed to concur in it. The first step in this plan of a coalition was to assume a common denomination, that of United Brethren. Heads of agreement were also adopted, and assented to by fourscore ministers in London; not with a view to any national constitution, but to preserve order in their own congregations, and to maintain harmony between the two parties. They consisted of nine articles, which were adopted to express a concurrence of sentiment, and to propose an union of conduct, on the several subjects to which they related. These subjects were churches and church members, the ministry, censures, communion of churches, deacons and ruling elders, synods, the demeanour to be observed towards the civil magistrate, confessions of faith, and the duty of living, and the deportment which should be observed, towards those who were of a different communion.*

* See Appendix No. III. ; and Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 532, note (s) ; and Harmer's Remarks on the present State of the Congregational Churches in Norfolk and Suffolk, p. 18, 25, 39, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50.

Mr. Howe had a principal share in drawing up this paper. But besides him, on the part of the presbyterians, Mr. Hammond, Mr. afterwards Dr. Williams, Mr. Stretton, Dr. Annesley, and Mr. Mayo, took a lead in the affair; and on behalf of the congregationalists, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Mead, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Lobb, Mr. James, and Mr. Mather, lent the aid of their judgment and their pens to this measure of mutual agreement. The enumeration of the topics on which these heads of agreement turned, shews that the assent related only to matters of church government and ecclesiastical discipline and order. By the eighth rule it was provided, that the union should not be dissolved by difference of opinion on doctrinal questions; for it was well known that such differences existed, particularly between Mr. Baxter and Mr. Cockayn, who were members of the union. This agreement, as particularly appears from the ninth article, indicated greater liberality of mind in the Presbyterians, than that denomination had expressed towards the Independents in the times preceding the death of Charles I.; when, they not only shewed towards them an inimical spirit, but declared with vehemence against that liberty of conscience for which the Independents were, to their honour, strenuous advocates.* The eighth article was undoubtedly meant to be conciliatory, and professedly sets up the scriptures, on points of faith, as a *perfect* and *only rule* of faith and practice; but it inconsistently combines with it

* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 440, last edition.

as auxiliaries, or as tests, the Articles of the Church of England, the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, and the Catechisms of the Assembly at Westminster; as if the scriptures were not sufficiently explicit and authoritative by themselves. The declaration honourable to the scriptures is weakened or rather done away by a subsequent clause.

The definition given of the Catholic visible Church, in the first article, as consisting of the whole multitude of *visible believers* and their *infant seed*, lies open to remark. It consists of contradictory ideas; the ideas of knowledge and conviction implied in the term *believers*, and the ideas of ignorance and compulsion necessarily connected with a state of infancy; and it was evidently pointed against the Baptists: And in the uncandid spirit of the times, when this sect, still in the commencement of its reputation and influence, was looked upon with prejudice and contempt, it appeared designed to exclude them from this plan of agreement.*

In this scheme of union, the united brethren studied by mutual concessions to compromise the differences between them. The Independents, it is

* "A Church," says Mr. Locke, "I take to be a voluntary society of men, joining themselves together of their own accord, in order to the public worship of God in such a manner as they judge acceptable to Him and effectual to the salvation of their souls. I say, it is a *free* and *voluntary* society. No body is *born* a member of any church; otherwise the religion of parents would descend unto children, by the same right as their temporal estates, and every one would hold his faith by the same tenure he does his lands; than which nothing can be imagined more absurd." Locke's Letter on Toleration, reprinted in 1800, p. 29.

worthy of notice, dropt the word *covenant*, which they had been fond of using to express the terms of their fellowship. They borrowed the expression from some transactions in the Old Testament; and as they derived it from the scriptures, it was esteemed by them extremely venerable and even sacred. Under the second article, they receded in some degree from the language of the platform of order in 1658;* where they made the previous election or preceding consent of the church as indispensable to the ordination of a minister, or the communication of office power to him; but here they insist on it as only ordinarily requisite. It was from the principle of compromise, it may be concluded, that in the article on the ministry, the term *teacher*, as distinct from pastors and ruling elders, was erased: though the distinction had been admitted by the old congregationalists, as what was to continue to the end of the world. Both Presbyterians and Independents, by their assent to these declarations, departed from the principles of their first institutions; namely, that
“ each particular church hath a right to choose
“ their own officers; and being furnished with such
“ as are duly qualified and ordained according to
“ the Gospel rule, hath authority from Christ for
“ exercising government and enjoying all the ordi-
“ nances of worship within itself: That, in the ad-
“ ministration of church authority, it belongs to the
“ pastors and other elders of every particular church
“ (if such there be) to rule and govern; and to the

* Last edition of Neal, vol. iv. p. 192.

“ brotherhood to consent according to the rule of the
“ Gospel.* It may be regarded as a virtual conces-
“ sion, that ordination is rather an act of devotion, than
“ an investiture with power, when the sixth section
“ of the second article admits, on the removal of a
“ minister formerly ordained to a new station or pas-
“ toral charge, a like solemn recommending of him
“ and his labours to the grace and blessing of God.”

It was a distinguishing characteristic of the spirit of these heads of agreement, that the authoritative power, assumed before this by the forms and claims of the presbyterian government in particular, was relinquished. In the preface, the imposition of these terms of agreement on others was disclaimed; all pretence to coercive power was owned to be as unsuitable to their principles as to their circumstances; and excommunication was defined to be no more than “ declaring scandalous and irreclaimable mem-
“ bers incapable of communion in things peculiar
“ to visible believers.” The prerogatives exercised in former days in synods and assemblies are brought down, by the sixth article, to “ occasional meetings
“ of ministers, and to a reverential regard to their
“ judgment ;” and, by article the fourth, to “ fre-
“ quent meetings together, that by mutual advice,
“ support, encouragement, and brotherly inter-
“ course, they may strengthen the hearts and hands
“ of each other in the LORD.” By the second section of that article it is conceded, that “ none of
“ their particular churches shall be subordinate to

* Sections 6 and 7 of the first article,

“one another, all being endued with an *equality of*
“*power* from Christ ; and that none of the said par-
“ticular churches, their officer or officers, shall ex-
“ercise any power or have any superiority over
“any other church or their officers.” These were
great concessions on the side of the Presbyterians ;
men, who, during the time of the Commonwealth,
had been in alliance with the state, and had exer-
cised in various provinces of the kingdom as well as
in London, an ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Their situa-
tion was now changed ; and it was necessary policy,
if not true liberality of spirit, to lay aside claims,
which they had no means of supporting by the emo-
luments or power of this world. This agreement
seems to have been the first step towards the decline
of the presbyterian discipline ; till at length, though
the name is retained by many societies of dissenters,
the distinguishing principles of presbyterianism are
lost ; and the independent mode of church govern-
ment is virtually, if not avowedly, adopted by all.
The coalition, the principles of which we have
stated, after the preliminaries of it were settled, was
commenced with a religious service at Stepney on the
6th of April 1691 : at which, by the appointment
of the united ministers, a sermon was preached
by Mr. Matthew Mead ; which was published under
the quaint title, but suitable to the occasion, and
agreeable to the taste of the age, of “ Two sticks
“made one,” from Ezekiel xxxvii. 19.

The dissenters would have shewn wisdom, and
probably have commanded greater respect, and had

greater weight with the nation, if besides this limited and partial agreement between the ministers in London and its vicinity, they had adopted a scheme of general correspondence throughout the kingdom, and had adhered to it with consistency and firmness. It would have laid a foundation for future vigorous and united exertions in a common cause; and would have precluded those clamours, which an attempt to form such an union has since raised.

It was however to their honour, that though they did not unite on a broad plan, which should comprehend all the body and its different denominations through the kingdom; they generally acted in concert, and were unanimous in the support which they afforded to the new government. Whereas in the church, contentions still existed. The zealous adherents to the abdicated king were solicitous to reinstate him on his throne; and a design was concerted to assassinate the reigning king in Flanders.* A controversy in favour of the deprived bishops agitated the church; and various tracts were published. Among others who refused the oaths, and afterwards distinguished themselves by a bitter and determined adherence to the cause of the exiled king, was Dr. George Hicks, whom James had promoted to the deanery of Worcester in 1683; a man of extensive learning, and particularly skilled in antiquities and the old northern languages. His conduct in the affair was singular.

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 138, &c.

At first he was willing to swear allegiance to King William and Queen Mary, resolved to do it, and determined, in order to give notoriety and solemnity to his pledge of fidelity to the new government, to take the oaths publicly in London. Previously to his setting out, a friend, foreseeing the danger of his being assaulted by his acquaintance in the city, and of his being thus diverted from his purpose, advised him to continue at Worcester. He resented the suspicion of his steadiness which such persuasions implied, and commenced his journey. His friend met him on the road, and renewed his cautions. To these he replied by declaring himself *fully convinced* that it was his duty to take the oaths. But when he reached town, he was led to entertain other sentiments on the subject; he said that he had been mistaken; and not only refused to take the oaths, but set himself at the head of those who refused to take them. He fell under suspension, of course, in August 1689, and was deprived in February following: and as he lived twenty-five years after this, he employed much of his time in writing in defence of the principles of the nonjurors.*

It was very natural that the deprivation of a number of the bishops and clergy should agitate the public mind. They who lost their preferments, lost their temper: though they were not hunted from place to place, or vexed with prosecutions and imprisonments; some of them indeed were doubly taxed, yet they lived unmolested; and some were

* Life of Bishop Kennet, p. 47, note.

permitted to name their successors into their benefices, who, it was believed, allowed to them the greater proportion of the emoluments. In the diocese of Salisbury, Mr. Martin, besides being continued in his living, received from Bishop Burnet, out of his own purse, the income of his prebend: for though he refused the oaths, he did not join in the schism of the nonjurors. Mr. Spinks was permitted to serve the donative which he enjoyed, by a curate. Mr. Jones's living was collated to a successor, whom he nominated. Dr. Beach kept his living two years after the sentence of the law pronounced him to be deprived of it; and though he was indicted and convicted for uttering seditious words, he was pardoned. This lenient treatment was pursued in other dioceses. But the diminution of income which these clergy sustained, if not the entire loss of the emoluments of office, and the obloquy under which their names fell, in the opinion of the majority of the nation, were felt to be grievances. These grievances provoked remonstrances; and the singular situation into which the clergy were thrown, produced questions concerning the indelible permanence of their sacred office and of episcopal authority, which were agitated with warmth.

The spiritual rights of the bishops against a lay deprivation were asserted and defended in "a Vindication of the deprived Bishops," a tract published at this time. There also came out a pamphlet entitled "Solomon and Abiathar: or the case of the deprived bishops and clergy discussed, in a dialogue between *Eucheres*, a conformist, and *Dys-*

“*cheres*, a recusant :” by Mr. Hill. The author’s design was to shew, that Abiathar voluntarily resigned the office of the priesthood, and was not removed from it by the authority of Solomon ; that he had no original legal claim to it ; and that of course on his withdrawing from the sacred office, it reverted to Zadok, without any title from the king. The tenor of this argument, in direct repugnancy to the statement of the historian, was evidently designed to prove, that the English monarch could not justify his deprivation of the bishops by the example of the Jewish king. The spirit of the writer and the spirit of the times appeared in the representation given by him of the state of things under King William, which he stigmatised as “ worse than a “ deluge of popery ; and the whole revolution,” he branded “ as a great impiety.” With such sentiments concerning the existing government, it is not surprising that the jacobites were frequently forming plots against it ; that disappointments in their designs enflamed their resentment ; and that events, which had an unfavourable aspect on the glory of the king’s arms and the security of his crown, such as the victory of the French at Landen, and the ruin of the Smyrna fleet, gave birth to exultations and rejoicings. “ It is amazing to think,” says a liberal writer, “ to what a length the interests and passions “ of some men will carry them.” A schism was attempted to be raised in the Church. The divines Dr. Tillotson and Dr. Sharpe, who had been elected to the sees of Canterbury and York, because

they were faithful to the government and zealous for it, because they were charitable to the dissenters and friends to the toleration, were represented as men who intended to undermine the church and to betray it. Some of the furious divines, who raised these clamours, were protected and preferred, from the hope that indulgence and favour would soften their tempers and correct their prejudices. They accepted their preferments as the rewards which they believed to be due to their merits; and employed the credit and authority which these preferments gave them, against the very prelates to whom they owed them.*

Amidst the agitations of the times, two events took place which were of a very gloomy cast; which appeared very inauspicious to the general cause of liberty, and to the rights and hopes of the dissenters in particular. On the 22d of November, 1694, died Archbishop Tillotson, whose high station had been made very uneasy, and whose spirits had suffered a great depression, by the virulent opposition of his enemies and by the reproach of evil tongues, though neither could provoke or frighten him from his duty. His mind was enriched with learning, and his heart was formed by the genuine spirit of goodness; in his character rectitude of principle was united with benevolence of disposition and sweetness of temper. The generous and liberal sentiments towards the dissenters, which distinguished him; and his advancement to that station of influence, dignity, and wealth, of which their favourite Sancroft had

* Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England, vol. ii. p. 653.

been dispossessed; exposed him to the displeasure of the high party, and drew on him their jealousy and resentment. The king and queen were much affected with his death; and with great reason, it awakened a general concern and deep sorrow throughout the nation. The event can now be viewed not only as affording to the prelate a calm retreat from the malice of his enemies, but as being even favourable to the cause, which appeared in his removal to have sustained an irreparable injury; for his mild and pacific spirit, observes Dr. Calamy, rendered him not so well able, as his successor Dr. Tennison, to contend with some difficulties, which, had he lived longer, he would have been called to encounter.

Dr. John Hall, bishop of Bristol and master of Pembroke college, on account of his moderation and piety, was recommended by a numerous party to fill the vacant see of Canterbury. Dr. Stillingfleet bishop of Worcester, who was eminently learned, was judged by many to be a man in all respects fit for the post, and his nomination to it was not only favoured by the inclinations, but supported by the earnest request, of the Queen: besides being obnoxious, however, to the envy and jealousy of some on account of eminent talents and erudition, besides his temper and notions being generally regarded as too high by the whigs, his tender frame and ill health disqualified him for the fatigues attached to that high station. The approbation of the ministry, the general concurrence of the clergy and people, and the esteem of their majesties, after all,

determined in favour of Dr. Tennison bishop of Lincoln ; a man who had many friends and no enemy ; who possessed firm health and an active temper ; who had served the cure of St. Martin, in the worst times, with singular discretion and courage ; and had restored a large neglected diocese to good order and discipline. He was nominated to the see of Canterbury on the 8th of December, and his consecration took place on January 16, 1695, in the church of St. Mary-le-Bow, London.

Within five weeks after the removal of Archbishop Tillotson, the Queen fell sick on the 22d of December 1694. Her illness soon appeared to be the small-pox, a disease which had been fatal to the royal family. It baffled the skill of the physicians and the power of medicine, and she died on the 28th of the same month, in the thirty-third year of her age, and in the sixth of her reign. Her personal accomplishments and virtues would in any station have created deep and mournful regret, through the circle in which she could not but have been admired and loved. Her capacity for government, and the wisdom of her administration in the absence of the king, displayed her great talents, and brightened the aspect of public affairs, which in other respects were of a melancholy complexion. Her zeal for the public good, her concern for the honour and prosperity of England, her attachment to the protestant religion, her regard to the rights of conscience, and her solicitude to promote union amongst her subjects, rendered her life peculiarly important, and

her death a just ground of deep and universal sorrow. She died more generally lamented than any princess in our history; and the national respect and grief were testified in an extraordinary manner. Both Houses of Parliament went in procession before the chariot in which her body was carried to the place of interment: and the Order of Council, besides requiring all persons to go into the deepest mourning, directed the nobility and gentry to furnish their servants with liveries of black cloth, and to cover their coaches with it. The people of Scotland, to shew how much they felt on this occasion, set apart a day of humiliation. The two Houses of Parliament gave the example of waiting on the king with most respectful and consolatory addresses. The clergy, the city of London, and other corporations and chief places of the kingdom, were not behind the legislative bodies in similar testimonials of their sympathy with the king, and of their deep sense of the queen's death. The dissenting ministers in London and its vicinity, who had peculiar reasons to express their participation of the general grief, approached the throne in a large body; and in a speech delivered by Dr. Bates, at their head, poured out their empasioned effusions of admiration and praise of the high perfections that shone in the person and actions of the deceased royal personage, and their strong assurances of inviolable fidelity and constant attachment to the person and government of the surviving sovereign.*

* For the Address at length, see Appendix No. iv.

Amidst the general expressions of high regard for the virtues and excellencies displayed in the character of the Queen ; and of universal sorrow on her death, there were not wanting publications which betrayed different sentiments. The funeral sermon for her Majesty was, at the King's appointment, preached ^{by} ~~at~~ Dr. Tennison. Some persons, from a prejudice against the new archbishop and from disaffection to the government, were severe in their animadversions on this discourse, and on others preached upon several solemn occasions, about this time, by other bishops and eminent ministers in the church. The nonjuring clergy were most forward in their censures ; and in the exasperated state of their minds, they did not refrain from malevolent aspersions on the king, and his deceased royal consort. The cry of passive obedience was renewed ; and the heaviest charges of producing famine at home and contempt abroad, of impoverishing and ruining the nation for ever, were brought against the Revolution. One pamphlet published in this strain was entitled " Remarks on some late Sermons : " another appeared in the form of " A Letter to the " Author of a Sermon preached at the funeral of " her late Majesty Queen Mary." This tract came from the pen of a worthy character, whose works had in general an obvious tendency to promote practical religion, and whose sermons were regarded as the genuine effusions of his heart. The author was Dr. Kenn, who had been deprived of the see of Bath and Wells ; whose attachment to James II.

or whose scrupulosity about the permanent obligation of his former oaths, rendered him inimical to the new government, and excited in his mind strong prejudices against the deceased queen, as having, in his apprehensions, violated filial duty and affection, when she was prevailed on to ascend her father's throne, and was made the instrument of superceding him.* The archbishop did not judge it proper or necessary to reply to this letter; which was meant to charge him with unfaithfulness in not availing himself of the opportunities afforded him, by his attendance on the queen in her last illness, to awaken a sense of guilt, where the prelate, viewing the conduct in a different light from his episcopal brother, doubtless thought that the royal personage had acted a virtuous and patriotic part. The author of the letter could scarcely entertain a hope that his remonstrance would have any other effect than that of exposing the conduct of the prelate to censure; and together with the "Remarks," affording a testimony of the spirit and sentiments with which the Revolution and the character of the queen were regarded by the writers of those pamphlets and by the party, of which they might be considered as the voice. It was to the honour of the archbishop, that though he was silent under the reproaches cast upon him, he was not inactive in the high station to which he was raised. One of his first acts after his advancement was to obtain from the king "injunctions to the

* Memoirs of Dr. Tennison, p. 31—41; and Granger's Biographical History of England, vol. iv. p. 290.

“ archbishops, to be communicated by them to the
“ bishops and the rest of the clergy, for reform-
“ ing the government of the church; enforcing a
“ regard to the canons relative to ordination; sup-
“ pressing abuses occasioned by pluralities, and pro-
“ viding for the regular and constant discharge of
“ clerical duties; and for a vigilant superintendence
“ of the lives and manners of the clergy.”

The tenor of such publications as those which we have noticed, afforded strong indications of the attachment to the exiled king, and of disaffection to the Revolution, prevailing in the kingdom; sufficient to give encouragement to the formation of schemes for the overthrow of the existing government. A stratagem to effect this object was concerted in France. The object was to invade England, and to assassinate the King in his coach, either as he should go out to hunt, or on his return. The leading conspirators were Sir Wm. Perkins, Captain Porter, La Rue, Robert Chaveroch, and others; at the head of whom was Sir George Barclay. The French army was marched to Dunkirk, to act when the opportunity favoured their exertions. The Duke of Berwick came over to prepare matters here. The transport ships, a small fleet of cruizers and a convoy of men of war, were in a silent manner brought together, and properly disposed; many regiments were embarked; and King James was waiting at Calais, that on the first notice of the success of the assassination, he might set sail; so nearly was the scheme brought to a crisis. The design was to strike the

blow on the 15th of February 1695—6 : but in the beginning of that month such a disclosure was made by La Rue, a Captain Fisher, and Pendergrafs, an Irish officer, as led to an investigation which defeated the project. Upon the detection of this design a royal proclamation was issued, promising large rewards to those who should apprehend any of the conspirators named in it ; so that few, except Barclay, escaped. The prisons were in a manner filled with such as were apprehended. Several of them were tried on indictments of high treason, and were executed. When Sir John Friend and Sir Wm. Perkins suffered death, three nonjuring clergymen, Mr. Cook, Mr. Snatt, and Mr. Collier, who had visited them in prison, attended them to the place of execution ; and besides assisting them with their exhortations and prayers, solemnly gave them absolution, by imposition of hands, before all the people : “ a strain of impudence,” says Bishop Burnet, “ as new as it was wicked.” These persons died, owning the ill designs in which they had been engaged, and expressing no sentiment of penitence for them. The conduct of the clergy who absolved them was a virtual approbation of their traitorous measures ; and a daring insult of the government, and of the legal proceedings which had sentenced them to death. The two former were committed, tried, and fined, as well as censured ; Mr. Collier made his escape. A declaration against this behaviour of the clergymen, as extremely insolent, as without precedent in the manner, and as altogether

irregular, was published by the archbishops and fourteen bishops, the whole of the episcopal bench then in town; and several nonjuring clergymen gave it under their hands, that it was neither the practice of the Church of England, nor allowable in such cases, to give absolution.*

When such a spirit shewed itself towards “the powers that were,” it is not surprising, if the friends and partizans of the new civil establishment were regarded with jealousy and resentment. The liberty granted to the dissenters to worship God according to their principles was all along the ground of complaint, and a grievance to many. Though all the former severities were not revived against them, they were borne hard upon at this time in several instances where the Act of Indulgence, had not specifically provided for their relief. Proceedings were commenced against several, especially Mr. afterwards Dr. Joshua Oldfield, then pastor of a congregation of dissenters at Coventry, for keeping academical seminaries. Mr. Oldfield was a man of distinguished talents and learning; who, previously to his settlement at Coventry, had lived several years at Oxford, and was in habits of friendly intercourse with some of the first scholars of the university; among others with Dr. Wallis and Mr. Dodwell, by whom he was highly esteemed. He had complied with the requisitions of the law by a declaration against popery, by subscription to the doctrinal articles of the Esta-

* Calamy, p. 550; and History of the Life and Reign of William III. p. 317, 12mo. 1744.

blished Church, and by taking the oath of allegiance to the government, in the support of which he joined an association. But these evidences of his protestantism and loyalty did not protect him from the spirit of intolerance. On the 6th of October 1696, he was cited to appear on the 14th of the same month before the ecclesiastical court, to be held at Coventry, for the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry. He was charged with teaching without a licence; and when he demanded a copy of the libel or articles against him, he was put off, and forced to attend again for it at Lichfield on the 26th. The libel *ex officio*, which was there delivered to him, accused him of teaching without licence, and also without subscription to the whole Book of Common Prayer and the thirty-nine articles entire, contrary to the 77th canon; though no charge of deficiency in any other qualification, or any criminality of conduct in other respect, was alleged against him. The judge earnestly pressed him for an immediate answer; and the utmost indulgence he could obtain, was to postpone his appearance in the same place till the 7th of November, the next court-day. When the day came, he replied by his proctor. One of his family happening to be present was so terrified by the judge himself, who threatened him with excommunication, as to bind himself by an oath to accuse the defendant; but, by withdrawing before the hour for his examination came, he evaded the obligation. Mr. Oldfield removed the cause to

Westminster-Hall, and obtained a *noli prosequi* from the Court of King's-Bench.

The learned Mr. Frankland, ejected from Bishop's-Aukland in Durham, who conducted, at different places of residence, an academical seminary of great reputation from 1669 to 1698, was, notwithstanding the protection and security which the Toleration Act offered, harassed by citations from the ecclesiastical courts from the Revolution in 1688 to his death in 1698, soon after he had obtained a similar prohibition to stop proceedings: in the mean time he had been excommunicated, on one of the citations, for non-appearance. Others met with trouble on the same grounds. The spirit of the law, which indeed, under great limitations, granted liberty of religious profession, and the known dispositions of the Court, were not sufficient to restrain the operations of intolerance without an appeal to the royal prerogative, to obtain from the liberality of the king the indemnity which the law ought to have guaranteed. The proceedings against Mr. Oldfield and Mr. Frankland, on account of keeping seminaries for classical and philosophical learning, were peculiarly groundless and illiberal, as both had studied at the Universities of Cambridge, and left that seat of science and literature with great reputation for talents and proficiency.* Prosecutions against men for opening schools and diffusing knowledge were more suitable to the age of Gothic barbarism, than to

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 551; Dr. Wm. Harris's Funeral Discourses, p. 382; and Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. i. p. 491,

times like those of the Revolution, when the day-star of light and liberty was rising on mankind.

The conduct of Sir Humphrey Edwin, a dissenter, and the lord-mayor of London this year, in carrying the regalia of his office to the meeting-house at Pinner's Hall, will be deemed by many to have been injudicious, and in those times of irritation calculated to raise jealousy and inflame the passions. The fact is, that unhappy consequences arose from it both in this and the succeeding reign. It was represented by a warm advocate for the church, not only as a reproach to the laws and magistracy of the city, that the mayor should carry the sword of state with him to, as the divine elegantly expresses himself, "a *nasty* conventicle," that was kept in one of the city-halls, but as *atrox facinus*, a horrid crime; and he called the plea offered in its defence, on the principle that the Act of Toleration as much established the religion of the dissenters as that of the nation, "an arrogant reason." The horrid nature of the crime, and the arrogance of the plea, could not be seen nor admitted by many who wished that this proceeding of the lord-mayor had been waved.

But the most marked and prominent feature of the times appeared in statute 8th and 9th, passed in the reign of King William III. intitled, "an Act for the more effectual suppressing of blasphemy and profaneness." Some years before this the controversy concerning the doctrine of the Trinity had been agitated; and *Unitarian* sentiments, called then as in the presentday, by way of obloquy, *Socinian*, had been

advanced and defended in various publications; which Mr. Firmin, a citizen of wealth, and a pattern of active and generous benevolence in various ways, as well as of zeal in religious matters, dispersed over the nation, and gave to any person who was disposed to read them. Great attention was excited; the subject became a common topic of discourse; indignant contempt was expressed against mysterious doctrines, as the contrivances of priests, actuated by a design to bring the world into a blind submission, and as governed more by the spirit of priestcraft than the love of truth. The friends of the received doctrines were alarmed; a great outcry was raised against Socinianism; and the enemies to the government availed themselves of the opportunity, either through real or pretended fears, to pursue steps and to use a language which tended to undermine it. In this ferment of the public mind, the Commons addressed the King, Feb. 17, 1698, to this effect. They requested his Majesty to issue out his royal proclamation to all the magistrates and justices of the peace to put in speedy execution the laws against profaneness and immorality, and to require from time to time an account of their proceedings on it: They besought his Majesty to discourage, in a particular manner, all vice, profaneness, and irreligion in those who had the honour to be employed near his royal person, or in his service by sea or land; to appoint strict orders to be given to all his commanders, not only to shew a good example, but to inspect the manners of those under them: and they entreated that his

Majesty on all occasions would distinguish men of piety and virtue by marks of his royal favour. They also solicited the king to give such effectual orders as to his royal wisdom should seem fit, for the suppression of all pernicious books and pamphlets, containing in them impious doctrines against the Holy Trinity, and other fundamental articles of faith, and to discountenance the authors and publishers of them.

The concern expressed by these senators for the suppression of vice, immorality, and irreligion, will be deemed truly laudable, worthy the friends of virtue and the guardians of their country's best interests. But in the last clause of their address they will be thought to have gone beyond their province as legislators, which was to define and secure the rights existing between man and man; and to form laws, as the times and the state of property might alter, for the protection of those rights. The civil magistrate is the guarantee to every citizen against injuries from his fellow citizens; but he is no umpire between God and man: he has no claim, by deputation from either, to decide what is religious truth; nor does he possess, either in his personal capacity or his official character, any peculiar prerogative or ability for the task. The same means of information, the same oracles of divine truth, lie open to the magistrate and to the subject: each is responsible to God for his religious opinions. In the times of which we are speaking, the force of these principles, which are more universally admitted in these days of better knowledge and superior liberality, was very partially

felt; and the application of them was, in general, made only to cases that related to ecclesiastical government or to religious ceremonies.

We are, therefore, less surprized, though we may be disposed to lament, that such an address from the Commons was followed by the statute which we have mentioned. This Act recited, that many persons had of late years openly avowed and published many blasphemous and impious opinions, repugnant to the doctrines of the Christian religion, very dishonourable to Almighty God, and in their tendency destructive to the peace and welfare of the kingdom. To provide against these evils, and to suppress, as the Act expresses it, "these detestable crimes," it prohibits such publications; and enacts severe penalties against any and every person, educated in the Christian religion, or who at any time had made a profession of it within this realm, who shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the persons of the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true, or the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine authority. To enforce these prohibitions, an incapacity and disability in law, to all intents and purposes whatever, to hold any office or employment, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, or a privation of any office or employment held and enjoyed by the offender at the time of conviction, is the punishment affixed to the first offence. To be disabled from any right of suing, prosecuting, pleading, or using

any action or information in any court of law or equity, from being guardian of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or capable of receiving any legacy or deed of gift, or of bearing any office civil or military, or any ecclesiastical benefice, for ever, within this realm, and an imprisonment for three years without bail or main-prize from the time of conviction, is the punishment assigned to the second offence. Some of the provisions in this clause seem to have been formed on the model of an edict by the Emperor Marcian in the sixth century, against the Eutychians and Apollinarists, by which they were rendered incapable of disposing of their estates, of making a will, or of inheriting any thing by the will of others, or by a deed of gift.* In one clause this statute may appear to express a degree of indulgence and lenity towards those who were convicted on it of any crime or crimes; as it provided, that on the acknowledgment and renunciation, within the space of four months, of the offence or of erroneous opinions, in the court where the conviction had taken place, such offender should be discharged from all penalties and disabilities incurred by such conviction.

Even this clause deserves to be reprobated, for it is insidious and ensnaring; holding out a temptation to the irresolute, and opening a door of escape from the penalties of the statute to those who are destitute of piety and moral rectitude. Can it be ascertained, whether a renunciation of opinions made under such circumstances is the effect of conviction, and

Furneaux's Letters to Blackstone, p. 28, note,

an unequivocal proof of sincerity? Does it not look very suspicious? Has it not the appearance of being the act of 'a dismayed hypocrite?' Such statutes are incompetent to the end proposed by them, namely, suppressing the avowal and checking the spread of any particular tenets. "No terrors, not even those of death, are strong enough," it has been well observed, "to prevent the virtuous character from making a profession of his religious sentiments. There have been men in all ages who have chosen to endure even an agonizing death, rather than withhold an open testimony to their convictions; and men there ever will be, who will think the profession of their religious sentiments a duty of indispensable obligation, and who will defy every hazard rather than conceal them."* If such statutes are incompetent to prevent the avowal of the sentiments against which they are levelled, the inflicting of the penalties they enact, instead of restraining the publication of such sentiments, promotes it, and gives a spread to them under circumstances that are very favourable to their reception. The case of a virtuous sufferer under the lash of such laws attracts notice, moves pity, gives a notoriety to his opinions, and raises his character for sincerity and fortitude in the estimation of the public. All these circumstances will give weight to his opinions, and turn the attention of men to them. "The words are gone forth, and cannot be recalled; the public curiosity is only attracted towards them by any species of legal cognizance

* A Treatise on Heresy, by a Barrister at Law, p. 122, 3. 1792.

“ whatsoever; a more general examination of the
 “ sentiment succeeds, and amongst the number of
 “ enquirers, some, of course, will become advocates
 “ for the opinions of the preacher. The poison has
 “ entered the circulation, and must have its course.”*

The inefficiency of such statutes exposes the folly of them, and draws on them just contempt. But in reference to the intolerance and cruelty which mark them, they deserve to be branded with the most opprobrious censures.

It at once awakens deep concern and rouses warm indignation, that such a statute remains, though men do not act on it, even in our day, to dishonour our legislative code. The times in which it passed were not equally enlightened with the present; a great horror existed in the minds of most men against the sentiments which it was framed to suppress. Even such a spirited and upright advocate of civil and religious liberty as Andrew Marvell, could complain that there was
 “ a very great neglect somewhere, wheresoever
 “ the inspection of books was lodged, that at least
 “ the Socinian books should be tolerated, and sell
 “ as openly as the Bible.”† The dissenters, in the address of their body to King William in 1697, had intreated and urged him to stop the press against the Unitarians; in which request they had in view the tracts written and circulated under the patronage of Mr. Firmin.|| The disposition to pass the statute

* A Treatise on Heresy, by a Barrister at Law, p. 125.

† Rehearsal Transposed, part x. p. 172, (1672); or Thompson's edition of Marvell's Works, vol. ii. p. 122.

|| Emlyn's Works, vol. ii. p. 374. Lindsay's Hist. View p. 302.

under consideration was unhappily countenanced by a precedent in the Long Parliament in 1648, which, by the influence of the presbyterians, had passed an Act similar to this, but with the severer penalty of death to be inflicted on the party condemned ; “ though indeed,” as Mr. Lindsey adds, “ three “ years- imprisonment is sometimes worse than “ death.” § No precedent, no prejudices, though they may extenuate the culpability of the legislature in passing such an Act, can wholly justify it ; especially as at that time several pens had ably asserted and defended the rights of conscience, explained the principles of free enquiry, and exposed the injustice of intolerance. There had been published “ An “ Essay concerning the power of the magistrate, and “ the rights of mankind in matters of religion ;” a tract, which if it were “ thoughtfully read and impar- “ tially considered,” was calculated to make every ingenuous reader ashamed of persecution.* There had appeared from the press “ An Apology for the “ Parliament, humbly representing to Mr. John “ Gailhard some reasons why they did not at his “ request enact sanguinary laws against protestants “ in their last session,” 1697. But the consideration which on this subject peculiarly wounds the reflecting mind is, that the statute of which we are speaking was not prevented by the close reasonings and liberal spirit with which the nation had been addressed about nine or ten years before in Mr.

§ My Review of the Life &c. of Biddle, sect. vi.

* An Apology for the Parliament, p. 39.

Locke's "Letter concerning Toleration;" which, though published first in Latin in Holland 1689, had excited so much attention as to have been translated in the same year into the Dutch, French, and English languages; and the English translation had, within that space, gone through two impressions, first in quarto and then in duodecimo. It is to be lamented, and to him who does not make allowance for the force of prejudice, and the slow progress of truth, however ably supported, it may appear surprising, that the weight and authority which this tract derived from the singular talents and eminence of the author, had not given a decided turn to the public mind in favour of full religious liberty. Mr Locke, it is to be noticed, was not the first writer on the subject; the public attention had been directed to it some years before, even during the civil wars, when the argument had been ably stated and discussed. The misfortune was, that "not only the government," as the judicious and enlightened translator of Mr. Locke's Letters observes, "had been partial in matters of religion, but those also who had suffered under that partiality," and had endeavoured by their writings to vindicate their own rights and liberties, had done it for the most part upon narrow principles, suited only to the interests of their own sects. Even Mr. Locke's generous principles were not, though stated in his clear and strong manner, immediately efficacious in enlarging and expanding the minds of men.

To this it is to be added, that political jealousies and interests blended their influence with religious zeal. This was very apparent in some subsequent proceedings against the papists. In the sessions of Parliament of 1698, an address was presented to the king, complaining of the boldness with which, from his Majesty's *unexampled clemency*, the papists had of late frequented the metropolis, and all places of public resort; and beseeching his Majesty to issue his royal proclamation against them. This the king promised to do. § The fact was, that many priests, alarmed at the evils which they anticipated from the effects of the revolution, had left the kingdom; but after the peace of Ryswick, they returned, accompanied by numbers of their order, and appeared about the town without reserve, and with an assumed boldness, presuming on the spirit of toleration which had begun to operate in favour of other sectarists. The enemies of the government availed themselves of this circumstance to asperse the whig ministers, as being indifferent to the interests of religion, and to throw out insinuations that the peace of Ryswick included a secret article in favour of popery. Even the king himself was accused of an attachment, or at least partiality to that religion. Under the pretence of zeal for protestantism, and from a malignant enmity to the friends of government, in the session of 1699, Mr. Howe, one of the most virulent jacobites in the house, under the fanc-

§ Belsham's History of Great-Britain from the Revolution, vol. ii, p. 8, 870.

tion of a committee, of which he was the chairman, brought in a bill of great severity. It inflicted a sentence of banishment upon all popish priests and schoolmasters, on pain of perpetual imprisonment in case of their return; and it offered a reward of 1000*l.* for their apprehension. It also enacted, that no papist, born after the 25th of March 1700, should be capable of inheriting either title or estate; or of purchasing lands, &c. either in his own name or in trust for another, within the realm. The most extraordinary clause of the bill was that which required all papists possessing estates in land to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and the test, when they attained the age of eighteen; and till they did it, the estate was to devolve to the next of kin that was a protestant.

The tenor of this bill and its progress through the house were marked by malignant insidiousness on the side of the party who moved it, and moved it with a design to perplex the measures of administration; for they indulged the expectation that the whigs, influenced by their principles of indulgence and toleration, would oppose it, and by such a line of conduct draw on themselves popular odium. Disappointed in this apprehension they would have dropt the bill. The court party were chargeable in this affair with a conduct irreconcilable to the maxims of fair and just policy, and were carried away by their zeal against popery. Bishop Burnet informs us, that he was in favour of this bill, “ notwithstanding his principles for toleration, and *against*

“all persecution for conscience sake.”* Both parties penetrating into each other’s designs, and jealous of each other’s success, were alert in manœuvres to counteract one another’s views, and to clog the bill with new clauses, unreasonable and severe, to prevent its being passed by the lords. But such fear lest popery should recover its power and influence was entertained, that the bill rapidly passed through both houses. Bishop Burnet, it is not to be doubted, spoke the sentiments of the lords, the commons, and the whole nation. “I had always thought, that if a government found any sect in religion incompatible with its quiet and safety, it might, and sometimes ought to, send away all of that sect, with as little hardship as possible.”* “A principle of policy,” observes a liberal historian, “which would furnish just as valid a pretence for the expulsion of the Moriscoes from Spain, or the Hugonots from France, as of the Papists from England.” The original cause of the supposed expediency and necessity of such measures exists in the alliance of the church with the state, and the connection of the civil power with a particular mode of religious profession. The rigour and severity which distinguish the measure adopted in the case before us, are most obvious; and have so affected the minds of men in our times, that the legislature has, with a generous unanimity, repealed the Act; and the repeal has had the sanction of national approbation.

* History, vol. iv. p. 333.

It may be remarked as the opprobrium of the times in which this bill passed, that there stands on record no protest against it by any of the lords; nor against the malignant statute, the terrors of which still hang over the heads of Unitarians; from whose sentiments, as they are grounded on free enquiry, and are not blended with any political interest, no danger to the state is to be apprehended. Neither of these bills, we may conclude, met with the hearty approbation of the king: he was reluctantly induced, by the influence of Parliament, and the imagined necessity of the times, to give his assent to them. This may be inferred from his answer to the Scotch commissioners, when they tendered to him an oath, containing a clause about *rooting out heresy*, that he was not *willing to be made a persecutor*.* His Majesty's known tenderness to dissenters, and aversion to persecution, brought on him the charge of intending, by tolerating all religions, to overturn the Established Church. "The former part of this character" argued him to have a just sense of "the rights of human nature, as well as of the true interests of Britain; the latter is a reflection, that discovers at once the ingratitude, ignorance, and bigotry of those who made it."†

Passing over the intervening political occurrences, we come to an event which tended to revive the hopes of the discontented, and to alarm the fears of

* Burnet, p. 332, 333; Belsham, vol. ii. p. 38, 39; Lindsey's Historical View, p. 305, note.

† Calamy, p. 619.

the true patriot, while it wore a gloomy aspect with reference to the cause of religious liberty, and the security of the protestant dissenters; this was the death of the king on the 8th of March 1701-2: a king, to whom they looked as their glorious deliverer from popery and slavery, to whose title they were true and firm adherents, and in whose service they were faithful. “To him the intellectual world is
“indebted for the full freedom of discussion, and the
“unrestrained avowal of its sentiments on subjects of
“the highest importance and magnitude. To him
“Britain owes the assertion and the final establish-
“ment of our constitutional privileges.”†

† Belsham, vol. ii. p. 222.

CHAPTER II.

Controversies agitated in the period between the REVOLUTION and the death of King WILLIAM.

SECTION I.

The Controversy respecting the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of Convocations.

“**T**HE Convocation or ecclesiastical synod in England differs,” observes Judge Blackstone, “considerably in its constitution from the synods of other Christian kingdoms: those consisting wholly of *bishops*; whereas, with us, the convocation is the miniature of a Parliament, wherein the archbishop presides with regal state: the upper house of the bishops represents the House of Lords; and the lower house, composed of representatives of the several dioceses at large, and of each particular chapter therein, resembles the House of Commons, with its knights of the shire, and burgessees.”* This constitution originated in the policy and necessity of Edward I. who, in the year 1219, when the knights, citizens, and burgessees were first summoned to Parliament by the royal

* Commentaries, vol. i. p. 280, ed. 179.

writ, issued also his writ to all the bishops of England to call together the clergy of their several dioceses at Westminster, to give him their help and counsel. This was the first national assembly to which the lower clergy were called by the king's writ. The object of the king was not so much to extend their privileges, and to raise their importance in the community, as to obtain aids from them; and to introduce a precedent and a method of taxing ecclesiastical benefices by consent of convocation. He accordingly demanded half the profits of their revenue for one year.*

In consequence of the debates and dissensions which arose in the convocation that met in the beginning of King William's reign, it was prorogued, as we have seen,† for 10 years. But the prorogations were conducted with exactness and regularity. With the opening of every other session of Parliament the convocation was summoned, and was in being with it. But as in the year 1665 the clergy had yielded up the right of giving their money in subsidies to the state by their own votes, and had submitted to be taxed by the House of Commons, there was at last nothing for them to do when they met;|| for, notwithstanding all the danger which threatened religion during the former reigns, they never pretended to sit and act as a synod. Under these circumstances they sat only for form's sake; the meetings were of course adjourned from time to

* Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England, vol. i. p. 479.

† Page 63. || Barnet, vol. v. p. 37.

time by the president, but always in a capacity to be convened whenever the exigences of church or state required their counsel and assistance. No such exigence happened for several years. This exemption from an unnecessary and expensive attendance, which was designed for the ease of the clergy, by releasing them from an obligation of absence from their cures, became by degrees a ground of complaint: they murmured at the frequent and renewed prorogations as a violation of their constitution; and they cast severe reflections on the Archbishop of Canterbury in particular, and on the episcopal bench, as neglectful of the interests of the church, and even disposed to betray them. These discontents were privately fomented among those of the lower clergy who were nonjurors. In 1697 these disputes became known to the world at large through the press; and the pen being taken up, the controversy was continued in different and successive publications. In these circumstances, while the public mind was agitated, and the clergy, in particular, were in no good temper, the Tory ministry, into whose hands the king had put the reins of government, demanded, at the very beginning of their administration, that a convocation should be permitted to sit. It was summoned and met in the church of St. Paul's in London, on Monday Feb. 10th, 1700. The convocation was opened with speeches full of severe reflections on the bishops, which, from an unwillingness to enter into disputes, they passed over in silence, and with a forbearance that did them credit. On

the 21st of February, Dr. Hooper, dean of Canterbury, a man of learning and good conduct, but reserved, crafty, and ambitious, was chosen, presented, and approved as prolocutor. The archbishop, Dr. Tennison, meant and actually attempted to prorogue the convocation on the 25th of the same month; but obstructions were thrown in the way of this measure. The constant method of adjournments had been this,—the archbishop signed a schedule for that purpose, by which the upper house was immediately adjourned; and that instrument being sent down to the lower house, it was likewise. On this occasion the clergy, aware that the continuance of their meetings depended on the will and pleasure of the archbishop, who could hinder or break off all debates by an adjournment, resolved to contest this point. When, therefore, the schedule of prorogation was brought down and delivered to the prolocutor, they continued sitting in defiance of it, and proceeded in some debates, which, though of no moment in themselves, expressed their determination to act independently of the archbishop's schedule. After this the prolocutor himself, by the consent of the house, intimated an adjournment, and appointed the next meeting to be held in Henry VIIIth's chapel, in opposition to the schedule; which included the whole body of the convocation, and to prevent separate and distinct meetings, had appointed it to assemble in the Jerusalem chamber.

These proceedings of the lower house were, with reason, considered by the archbishop and the ma-

jority of his suffragans, as setting up a claim of separate interest and power. The union of a provincial synod was broken, the good correspondence between the two houses was destroyed, and the common methods of business were frustrated. On February 28th, when the fourth session was held, the prolocutor and clergy, acting on the principle of their last adjournment, did not meet his grace and the bishops in the synodical place, the Jerusalem chamber. This conduct was justly interpreted as a second contempt of the authority of the president and of the obligation of the schedule, the instrument of continuing or adjourning the convocation.

To come to an understanding on the points of difference between the two houses, the archbishop, with the consent of his episcopal brethren, sent for the prolocutor, and put to him these two questions. First, "Whether the lower house did sit after they were prorogued by his grace on the 25th of February?" And secondly, "whether they did meet that very morning without attending in the Jerusalem chamber, to which they were prorogued?" After some discourse which these questions brought on, the prolocutor said, "that the lower house was preparing a paper to lay before his grace and the upper house concerning the method of prorogation and some other matters of form." The archbishop replied in his own name and in the names of his brethren, that though they thought fit for the present to continue the usual practice, they were ready to receive and consider what should be offered

by the clergy, and to adopt such measures upon it as should appear to be just and right. As an instance of a conciliating temper, it was immediately added in the schedule of that day, to preclude ambiguity and dispute, after in *hunc locum*, “vulgo vocat: *Jerusalem chamber.*” The lower house submitted to this with a *salvo jure*; and on the next session, the 6th of March, agreeably to the definite form of the last schedule, gave their attendance in the Jerusalem chamber. On being soon dismissed, they returned to their own house, and prepared a report from the committee, which had been appointed to search the records of the convocation for directions relative to the prorogations of their house; which in a little time they carried up to the upper house.

In this paper they asserted that it had been the usage of the lower house to continue its sittings till adjourned or prorogued by the prolocutor or his deputy, and not always to adjourn on the same day with the upper house. They also alleged, on the authority of some precedents, that it had been the common practice of their house, when the upper house was adjourned by the words in *hunc locum*, to meet apart in the particular place where they had sat last, distinctly from their lordships; even when the upper house had been adjourned to a place particularly specified by name, as St. Paul’s, or Lambeth. They further pleaded that they found no evidence to prove that it had ever been the practice of the lower to attend the upper house before the former had met and sat according to its own adjournment; but

when it had first met and sat, they then, at their own motion, or by a special message, attended the bishops on business.

This paper was entitled “a Report of the Committee,” and did not run, as it should have done, in the name of the “house;” but the archbishop, without taking any advantage of this informality, directed it to be read, and then referred the examination of it to a committee of the bishops; who drew up a copious reply to it, in which all their precedents were examined and answered.

In the mean time the archbishop delivered to the prolocutor the form of an “humble Address to his Majesty,” for the consent and concurrence of the lower house; which was given, with one alteration only, by the substitution of the phrase “reformed churches” instead of “reformed religion.” It thanked his Majesty for his constant protection and favour to the Church of England. It acknowledged his pious concern for the reformed churches in general; and it expressed an assurance of steadfast fidelity and affection, and a readiness to maintain the supremacy of the king, as settled by law. This address was presented on the 10th of March to his Majesty; who accompanied his gracious reception of it, and his thanks for the promises which it contained, with an assurance, that he would never extend his supremacy beyond the law.

The lower house sat for some time in deliberations on a reply to the answer of the bishops; but instead of proceeding in it, they desired a free conference.

This was refused by the bishops, as a step altogether new; for though the clergy had, on some occasions, and to explain some point, been invited to a conference with the bishops, they had never before presumed to propose and to desire it of themselves. It was resolved, therefore, not to admit a conference; but to require an answer to the paper which had been sent to them. The lower house, on the other hand, refused to comply with this requisition, and resolved not to notice the archbishop's adjournment, except in adjourning themselves on the day appointed in his schedule, but by their own act, and to intermediate days.

While these disagreements concerning their respective prerogatives and privileges existed between the two houses of convocation, the lower house stepped forward in an unusual manner to exercise authority, and display their zeal in religion. They collected and examined several books, in which the received principles of the church, which had the name of orthodox, were impugned and controverted. They noted down the obnoxious passages, which they censured as erroneous; and wanted nothing but the king's leave to sanction their censures, and to introduce new canons into the church. They began with a treatise, which had been published in 1696, entitled "Christianity not mysterious," by Mr. John Toland; a work which excited much attention, created an alarm, and exposed the author to the blind and unrelenting malice of bigots in power. On the 20th of March, the prolocutor carried up to the upper house

a representation of this book, on the ground of some propositions injudiciously selected from it, as a treatise of pernicious principles, and of dangerous consequence; and they requested their lordships to concur in the censures and resolutions which they had passed in reference to it; and to adopt effectual measures to suppress such publications. The bishops, though they held Toland and his work in equal abhorrence with the clergy, considered this forwardness and activity of the lower house to judge and decide in points of faith, as striking directly at episcopal authority. They were surprised to see such important acts of church government assumed by men who had long asserted the divine right of episcopacy, and had maintained that presbyters were no more than their assistants and council. They were also jealous of the credit, which it appeared to be the aim of the clergy to secure to themselves, by this shew of zeal for the great articles of religion. Under these impressions the bishops demurred on the proposals of the lower house; and determined to take the opinion of council, how far the Act of Submission,† in the 25th of Henry VIII. restrained them.

† By the Act of Submission, which originated in convocation, and which, at the request of the clergy, had been confirmed in Parliament, they acknowledged, “that all convocations ought to be assembled by the king’s writ; and promised, *in verbo sacerdotii*, “that they would never make nor execute any new canons or constitutions without the royal assent; and since many canons had been received that were found prejudicial to the king’s prerogative, “contrary to the laws of the land, and heavy to the subjects, that “therefore there should be a committee of 32 persons, 16 of the “two Houses of Parliament, and as many of the clergy, to be named

On the case being submitted to the judgment of the lawyers, some were afraid, and others were unwilling, to give a decided opinion. But Sir Edw. Northey, afterwards the attorney-general, thought that to condemn books was a step of great consequence, as it might, by censuring some explanations and allowing others, affect and alter the doctrine of the church; and that the convocation, since it had no license from the king, would incur the pains in the statute by intermeddling in such matters. The bishops, directed by this advice, suspended all further debate on this business.

Another publication, which came under their examination, and incurred their censure, was Bishop Burnet's "Exposition of the Articles." "They fell upon it," says a modern writer, "with the utmost fury, as a performance full of scandal to the church, and dangerous to religion."† They were much prejudiced and highly incensed against the author; and this gave an unavoidable bias to their judgment in reviewing his work. In imitation of the impeachments by the House of Commons, they expressed their censure of this book in three general charges: That it allowed a diversity of opinions, which the articles were framed to avoid: That it contained many passages contrary to the true meaning of the articles, and to other received doctrines of "by the king, who should have full power to revise the old canons, and to abrogate, confirm, or alter them, as they found expedient, the king's assent being obtained."—Neal's Hist. Puritans, vol. i. p. 14. ed. 1793; or Parsons's Abridgement of Neal, vol. i. p. 2.

† Archdeacon Blackburne's Works, vol. v. p. 274.

the church: and That some positions in it were of dangerous consequence to the church as by law established, and derogatory from the honour of the Reformation.

This paper of complaints having been read and taken into consideration by the bishops, the president observed to the prolocutor, that it contained general assertions only, without proofs. He required in the name of the bishops that the lower house should send up the specialties or particulars on which their charges were founded. The prolocutor, and the members who attended him, returned to the lower house, and it was supposed that the clergy were preparing their particular charges against the Bishop of Sarum's work. After waiting some time, a proper officer, Mr. Tillot, was sent to enquire of the prolocutor, whether any propositions relative to particular passages in it were in readiness to be presented to the archbishop and bishops. The messenger soon came back with the following abrupt answer: "This house desires Mr. Tillot to return their lordships their humble thanks for their message; and to tell them, that this house is preparing business, but are not yet ready with it." It was never learned what were the particulars to which the general heads of censure referred. "It was," says Burnet, "a secret lodged in confiding hands." It should be mentioned to the honour of this prelate, that so far from evading an examination of his book, he begged the archbishop to dispense with the order against further communications on the subject.

On receiving the message delivered by Mr. Tillot, the archbishop and bishops, in a committee, came to a declaration of their judgment on the steps taken in this matter by the lower house. They delivered it as their decision, “ That the lower house had no
“ power, judicially, to censure any book: That they
“ ought not to have entered upon the examination
“ of a book written by a bishop of the church, without first acquainting the president and bishops
“ with their design: That censuring the work of
“ the Bishop of Sarum in general terms, without alleging the particular passages on which the censure was grounded, was defamatory and scandalous: That the Bishop of Sarum, by his excellent
“ History of the Reformation, approved by both
“ houses of Parliament, and by other writings, had done great services to the Church of England, and had justly deserved the thanks of their house: And that though private persons may expound the
“ articles of the church, yet it could not be proper
“ for the convocation, at that time, to approve, much less to condemn, such private expositions.” By these decisions of the upper house the lower was restrained from proceeding, in their corporate capacity, to those extremities to which they shewed a strong inclination. The task of animadverting on the Bishop of Sarum’s treatise was assigned to an individual, generally supposed to be Dr. Binckes, who they had good reason to believe would make the most of it to the public; and who, in the name of his brethren, published, in 1702, “ A prefatory

Discourse to an examination of a late book, entitled, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, by Gilbert bishop of Sarum.*” In which discourse he is said to have pursued the exposition with sufficient spleen.*

Previously to the 30th of May, when the prolocutor of the lower house first laid before the upper house the representation of their sense upon the Bishop of Sarum’s “*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles,*” the archbishop and the bishops had proposed that a committee, consisting of a select number from the upper house and an equal number from the lower house, should meet and consult, in order to an amicable adjustment of the points in dispute between them. But the lower house declined coming into any such agreement. On which his grace and their lordships declared, that they would receive nothing from the lower house till the irregularities which attended its proceedings were settled. When, therefore, the document in which they criminated the publication of the Bishop of Sarum was presented, the archbishop read to the prolocutor and his attendants a paper drawn up by the consent of the bishops, and sanctioned by their approbation, declaring “that they could not receive
“any thing offered from the lower house, till the
“late irregularity of refusing to meet the committee
“of the bishops, for inspecting the books of the
“convocation, was set right.” A copy of this paper was, at his desire, presented to the prolocutor.

* Blackburn ut supra.

On this, he and those who accompanied him, went to the lower house; and returning within a few minutes waited in the chamber adjoining to the Jerusalem chamber. Here they were met by Humphrey bishop of Bangor, who, by the direction of the archbishop, asked the prolocutor, “whether the message he was now charged with, was to set the irregularity complained of right?” The bishop, returning to the house, reported that at first the prolocutor replied, “that it was something in order to set that irregularity right;” but then, as if recollecting himself, he said, “it was concerning that irregularity.” On this the prolocutor and his attendants were called in; and his grace expressed the readiness of the house to receive any proposal that tended to set right the irregularity of which it had complained. The prolocutor replied, it was something concerning it; and then read to them these words: “The paper that the lower house ordered the prolocutor to present to your grace and their lordships, was their humble representation concerning a book, entitled, ‘An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England,’ and hath no relation to the supposed irregularity your grace and your lordships think fit to complain of: of that we are ready to give your lordships satisfaction, when thereunto called; and in the mean time most humbly request that your grace and your lordships will be pleased to receive the said paper.”

The manner in which this paper was introduced and presented, excited the surprize of the archbishop

and the bishops at the conduct of the prolocutor. The Bishop of Bangor in particular entered a complaint against it, in a writing signed by his own hand, and charged him with prevarication; for when the bishop had put the question to him, whether the message he had to bring in was to set right the irregularity, of which the upper house complained, he replied, first, that "it was something to set that irregularity right;" then he said, "it was concerning that irregularity;" and at last it appeared that the message he brought concerned wholly another matter.

When the archbishop and bishops declared their judgment on the proceedings of the lower house against the work of Bishop Burnet, which was on the 13th June —, they took a decided part with the Bishop of Bangor in the altercation between him and the prolocutor, by a declaration that he had made a true and just report of the prolocutor's answer at the door of the house, which corresponded in effect with the answer which he made in the house to the archbishop; that the paper which he read, relative solely to the Bishop of Sarum, had no reference to the irregularity complained of; and that the prolocutor's answer was such as by no means ought to have been given by him to the archbishop, or any member of the house. On the same day they passed a vote of approbation on Dr. Verney and other dissentients from the majority in the lower house, for having acted, in their opinion, to the dictates of right and duty; and as deserving the protection of

the upper house in maintaining the just rights of convocation. The prolocutor and some members of the lower house incurred their censure, for having violated the methods of proceeding in convocation, endangered the constitution of the church, and been guilty of manifest disobedience and contempt.*

All the bishops, except the bishops of London, Rochester and Exeter, concurred in these proceedings. Dr. Compton, who filled the see of London, had for several years united himself to the Tories; and though with little authority or force, had opposed the court in every thing. His hopes of being advanced to the see of Canterbury had also been twice disappointed. Dr. Spratt, who presided over the diocese of Rochester, had entered deeply into the measures of the former reigns; and during this he adhered to his party with firmness, though the irregularities of his life did it no honour. Sir Jonathon Trelawney, at that time the bishop of Exeter, was the avowed patron and defender of the synodical rights of the clergy.† These bishops entered their dissent to the resolutions of the upper house; yet, though they adhered to the lower house, they conferred no great reputation on its proceedings.‡

While the lower house declined, amidst these alterations, acceding to the proposal from the upper

* Burnet, vol. v. p. 40, 41, 42. Calamy, vol. i. p. 607—8, Archbishop Tennison's Life, p. 77—91.

† Atterbury's Sermons, dedication, p. 2.

‡ Burnet, vol. v. p. 44, vol. i.

house, that the points in dispute between them should be referred to a committee, formed of a select and equal number from each, they did not treat the proposal with entire neglect ; but on June 6th, delivered in a paper, in which they gave their reason for not meeting the committee of the bishops. They intimated that they were a distinct house, and claimed a liberty to admit or decline at their own discretion the appointment of committees ; and that they could see no ground for such a committee. They pleaded, that the bishops had no regular way of becoming acquainted with the transactions of their house, but as they were laid before them ; and that if the inspection of their journal was demanded as a right, they might reasonably insist on their liberty : That before the upper house required the inspection of their present proceedings, they had reason to expect from their lordships to be put in possession of the journals of the lower house for the years 1586, 1640, 1661, &c. which of right belonged to them. They complained that they were discouraged by the declaration, that what they had done was of dangerous consequence ; and that their lordships' sentence, cutting off all intercourse between the two houses was not only over severe, beyond the occasion, but that for the present it destroyed the whole design and very being of a convocation.

This paper was referred to the examination of a committee of bishops, who drew up a full and explicit answer to it. In this answer they remon-

strated, that it would have been becoming in the lower house to have acknowledged the patience and tenderness of the upper house. They stated, that on searching for precedents, they found that they had a right to appoint committees; and that it had been the uniform practice of the lower house to comply with such appointments. They complained, that the lower house, by their refusal, had disobeyed the authority of the president and bishops, and destroyed the intercourse between the two houses; and for this conduct they might have been proceeded against by canonical admonitions and censures, which had hitherto been forborne; but that till they returned to their duty, business could not proceed. The lower house, it was urged, in the reasons which they had offered for their justification, had evidently mistaken both right and fact. They had assumed to themselves to be an independent body; when the whole convocation was but one body, of which the archbishop was the head; and both houses had always been continued or prorogued by one instrument or act. Their aim in the motion to have the books inspected, it was pleaded, was to prevent mistakes, and to take away all occasion of disputes and controversies between the two houses. The complaint of wanting former journals, as if the lower house had a right to keep them, if they knew where, was censured as very unreasonable and unjust; for it was pleaded, that the registers and acts of both houses belonged to the archbishop; and that the ancient registers were deposited in the library

at Lambeth, where any persons might have free access to them. It was also said, that if the lower house had met the bishops, they might have convinced them, that adjourning themselves and other transactions were at once illegal, and of dangerous consequence. It was therefore recommended to them to consider of their irregularities.*

In the session of June 20, the prolocutor, accompanied by the greatest part of the lower house, appeared after prayers, holding in his hand two distinct papers, and offering to deliver both. On which the president addressed him to this effect: “ That
“ he could receive no paper from him, but that
“ which contained the particularities of the general
“ charge against the Bishop of Sarum; which, at the
“ request of the said bishop, he was then ready to
“ receive.” To this the prolocutor replied, “ That
“ he had two papers in his hand ready to present to
“ his grace and the rest of the bishops then present,
“ if his grace would receive them; but without the
“ direction of the lower house, he could not present
“ one separately from the other; and that therefore
“ he would return and take the opinion of the
“ house.” But he never came back with that opinion. The convocation was prorogued by royal writ, first to August the 7th, then to September the 18th; and soon the Parliament was dissolved, and the convocation with it. “ From the fire thus
“ raised in convocation, a great heat,” says Bishop Burnet, “ was spread throughout the whole clergy

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 606, 607.

“ of the kingdom ; it alienated them from their
“ bishops, and raised factions among them every
“ where.”*

A new convocation of the province of Canterbury was summoned to meet at the same time with the Parliament, on 30th December 1701; Dr. Sherlock, dean of St. Paul's, opened it, in that church, with solemn prayers, and a sermon in Latin. Dr. Woodward, dean of Sarum, a civilian, grown popular by opposing his diocesan, to whom he owed his preferment, was elected prolocutor, in preference to the learned Dr. Beveridge, the archdeacon of Colchester, by a majority, and confirmed by the archbishop.

Unanimity prevailed at first between the bishops and the clergy; and both houses readily concurred in the first synodical act, which was addressing the king. The address expressed, with one feeling, their deep resentment of the indignity offered to his Majesty by the French King, in declaring the pretended Prince of Wales to be the king of his Majesty's realms and dominions; against whom, whilst they renewed their protestations of firm and unshaken allegiance, they assured him of their best endeavours to maintain, in their respective places and stations, his rightful title to the crown, and the succession to it in the protestant line.

But these auspicious omens of union did not last. The faction raised in the lower house had still the majority; and six days after the address had been

* Burnet, vol. v. p. 42.

presented to the king at Kensington, a question arose concerning the right of adjournment, whether it was vested in the archbishop alone, or whether the lower house had the power to adjourn itself. This question revived and widened the differences between the two houses. A difference of opinion on this point had in every session led to disputes, but they had been managed with peace and order; and the house, whatever notions of independency had been advanced by a few individual members, had hitherto so adapted the entries in their journal, that all unanimously met upon the synodical days and hours appointed by the archbishop in his schedules of prorogation. But on January the 28th, 1702, a member of the lower house unhappily moved to change the form of entry in their minutes, and to use the phrase *dominus prolocutor continuavit et prorogavit quoad hanc domum*. The motion was carried; and by this form the prolocutor, instead of intimating that the house was continued or prorogued, adjourned or continued its meetings in his own name.

In the next sessions, on February the 3d, several members objected to this entry: but, by the votes of a majority, it was resolved, “that there should be no alteration, and that the matter should not then be further debated.” The house was about to proceed to other business, when the schedule of prorogation came down from the upper house. Upon which a member moved, “that the message which he observed had been delivered to the pro-

“locutor, should be communicated to the house,
“which he thought they had a right to insist on.”
This was opposed by the majority; and they proceeded to appoint a committee of grievances. After this the prolocutor adjourned, as by the authority of the house. Against this adjournment the dissentient members made a verbal protest, declaring, “that the House had no pretence of right to adjourn itself, when the schedule from the archbishop interposes to prorogue the whole convocation; and that therefore they protested against the irregular way of adjourning adopted at that time.” This verbal protestation was put into writing before the next meeting on the 9th of February, when Dr. Freeman, dean of Peterborough, moved, “that the protestation should be admitted and entered into the journal of the house, as a standing evidence of their asserting the just rights and authority of their metropolitan as their president.” This was opposed by a majority; and matters would have been carried to a great height, had not a question proposed by Dr. Beveridge prepared the way for some conciliatory concessions on a future day.

The question put by Dr. Beveridge was, “Whether, upon supposition that the house may sit upon synodical business after the coming down of the schedule, till they think their business over, the house would agree that the schedule should be then executed, and the house prorogued to the day and hour therein specified by virtue

“ of the said schedule, and in obedience to the
“ authority whereby the whole convocation was
“ prorogued.” To evade a reply to this ques-
“ tion, it was, after some debates, agreed to
appoint a committee to consider of an expedient
to compose the disputes about the prorogation of the
lower house. Eight members were chosen on each
side for this purpose. On that of the lower house,
Dr. Hooper, Dr. Jane, Dr. Aldrich, Dr. Binckes,
Mr. Needham, and Dr. Wynne: on that of the
upper house, Dr. Beveridge, Dr. Hayley, Dr.
Willis, Dr. Kennet, Dr. Prideaux, and Mr.
Lloyd. This committee met on February 10th:
and it was agreed for the sake of accommodation,
first, “ that no forms of prorogation should be
“ used hereafter by the prolocutor, that were not
“ used before the last convocation: secondly, that
“ the forms used by the prolocutor in the convoca-
“ tion of 1586 and 1588, should be hereafter used
“ by the prolocutor, in the order in which they lie
“ in the books, beginning with the first, till they
“ they are all gone through: and thirdly, that these
“ forms should be pronounced by the prolocutor,
“ when the house agreed that their business
“ was over.”

After this, some boasted of the advantage gained
on the side of the convocation, and declared that the
cause of the archbishop had been given up by his
friends; and they excluded the schedule from any
concern in the adjournment. To obviate this con-
struction, others prepared a paper in time for the

next sessions ; to declare “ that they understood
“ the latter part of the agreement aforesaid, with an
“ exception of any case when the president should
“ see cause to send an order with the schedule,
“ signifying the express time of intimating the pro-
“ rogation upon that day. Otherwise, if it were
“ pretended to mean that the authority of the
“ archbishop, or any order sent from the upper
“ house, was thereby excluded or diminished ; they
“ then solemnly protested against any such meaning
“ or intended meaning.” The right members also
drew up a declaration of the sense in which they
understood the articles of agreement ; and among
other things, they alleged their refusal to consent to
an alteration that was offered on the third article,
viz. “ that the form should not be pronounced by
“ the prolocutor, till the house agreed that the
“ business was over.” The principle on which they
grounded their refusal was this : “ That though
“ they might generally presume upon the arch-
“ bishop’s consent for their sitting to dispatch all
“ proper business, yet they could not agree to any
“ proposition that would preclude his right to pro-
“ rogue them immediately, if he found it expedient.”
They added that they used the words “ pronounced
“ by the prolocutor,” to prevent any question about
“ adjourning themselves” being put to the house.

The next session would have been held on the
12th of February, but a particular occurrence in-
duced the archbishop to prorogue it to the 14th.
The prolocutor being indisposed appointed Dr.

Aldrich, dean of Christ-church, to act in his place. The members who disavowed the proceedings of the majority, expressed a disposition to accept the deputation, if application were duly made to the president to approve and confirm it. To this the majority appeared to agree; and one of the leading members, Dr. Atterbury, said, "that there was no design to make a common referendary between the two houses, without consulting his grace." Yet it was resolved that no such application should be made. The archbishop, therefore, sent for the clergy to the Jerusalem chamber, and prorogued the convocation to the 14th; telling them, "that an incident of great moment had happened, on which he and his brethren must take time to consider." He then ordered Mr. Tillot to read the schedule. On the 13th Dr. Woodward died; and when the houses met the next day, the archbishop, expressing his surprise at the news, adjourned them to the 19th: on that day, as no business was depending, his grace prorogued the convocation to the 5th of March.

The prolocutor, Dr. Woodward, previously to his illness, had, in order to recommend himself to a great party, lodged a complaint of a breach of privilege in the conduct of his diocesan Dr. Burnet, his best friend. The case was this: the clergy had paid their attendance on the bishop through his visitation, which he constantly held in person, in a regular and respectful manner: but the dean of Sarum had, not only without offering any excuse, declined appearing

as rector of Pewsey, but aggravated his absence with signs of contempt. The bishop ordered a citation in the usual method, before any privilege of convocation could be pleaded, or could exist. When the time of privilege afterwards commenced, he directed his chancellor to put a *stet* upon the case; and no further proceedings in it took place. This light matter was made the ground of a complaint and remonstrance to the upper house on the 9th of February. It was represented not only as an unlawful molestation of a member of the lower house, but as an injury offered to the whole body of the convocation, in the person of the referendary between the two houses. The archbishop and bishops answered, that the proceedings referred to commenced when there was no privilege; that upon opening of the convocation, a *stet* had been put upon the case; and that no citation of process had been since decreed. The beginning and prosecution of this complaint were marked, indeed, with so much partiality and prejudice, that many persons of candour and equity hoped that the author, if he lived, would have repented of it.

In reference to this matter and other points of litigation which had been agitated between the two houses, the archbishop closed the session with a conciliatory speech. His grace reminded the lower house, that the complaint against the Bishop of Salisbury for a breach of privilege had been readily admitted by the bishops, and by no one with more readiness than by the bishop himself: that the

answer promised for the next day, though prepared to be given and lodged in the records of the bishop's court at Salisbury, was not communicated, on account of the prolocutor's illness. Appealing to that answer, his grace expressed his hope that the clergy would not suffer themselves for the future to be surpris'd into complaints, till they were fully assured that those complaints were well founded both in *fact* and *right*. He stated the delicacy and difficulties of immediately proceeding to the election of a new prolocutor, in the absence of many of the clergy, at a great distance from London, on the duties of their respective cures at the solemn time of Lent, when no synodical business was yet before the convocation by royal authority; and when a war, which would divert the thoughts of men from business of this nature, was breaking out. He expressed his concern at the heats which had arisen, as "giving great scandal and offence even to those who understood not the nature of the controversy, but were much concerned that there should be any difference among men who, by profession, were the ministers of the gospel of peace." He concluded with an affectionate exhortation; beseeching his brethren to look forward to the things that make for peace, and whereby he said, we may edify one another, and the established church, of which, by the singular goodness of God, we are members; so that those differences which have continued too long already, may be speedily and happily compos'd. To which end I

“ I heartily commend myself and you to the God of
“ peace and unity, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

The reasons offered by the archbishop for postponing the choice of a prolocutor, and the lenient spirit of his speech, satisfied a great part of the clergy; and they were pleased with the opportunity of returning to their churches and families; and determined to wait till some emergent occasion would require that a prolocutor should be elected, or that the convocation should sit. But others discovered great discontent, and would meet two days after in Henry VIIIth's chapel, to form themselves into an assembly, and to choose a moderator or chairman. When the day to which the archbishop had prorogued both houses arrived, they proceeded as a house, without a prolocutor, to the chamber adjoining to the Jerusalem chamber; and meeting with the Bishop of Lincoln, who, as his grace's commissary, had again prorogued the convocation to a future day, they requested him to inform the archbishop that it was their desire to proceed to the choice of a prolocutor. The bishop, with great kindness of deportment, declined carrying a verbal message to his grace, lest he should fall into a mistake in the delivery of it; but offered, if they pleased to dictate to him, to take their sense in writing, and lay it before him. On this they replied, “ That it was the unanimous desire of the
“ lower house of convocation,”—Here they were interrupted by a member of a different opinion, the chaplain of the archbishop, who had that morning

waited upon his lordship ; he modestly interposed with his dissent, and expressed his “ hope that no such
“ message would be delivered in the name of the
“ *whole* lower house ; for as without a prolocutor
“ they were not a house, and did not act in that ca-
“ pacity, so many of the members, and he himself
“ for one, had not assented to any such message ;
“ he presumed, therefore, that it would be more
“ proper to let the message run in the name of
“ *several* members of the lower house.” The
bishop, in writing down their message, expressed it in
this limited manner. This raised a new clamour.
They who assumed the name of a house, particularly,
Dr. Finch, warden of All-Souls college in Oxford,
cast severe reflections on the member who proposed
the alteration of their motion ; and accused him as
a betrayer of their rights and liberties, though no
one had with greater assiduity and care ascertained,
or with greater firmness asserted, all the rights and
powers that were agreeable to the practice of
former convocations, and consonant to the established
constitution of the English church and state. A few
days after, on the 8th of March 1702, King William
died. By this event the convocation was virtually
dissolved: for the authority of the archbishop’s man-
date, by which the convocation was assembled,
depended on the king’s writ, the force of which
terminated at his death ; and the Act of Parliament
which empowered the Parliament to sit after this event,
made no provision for the continuance of the con-
vocation : but when, on these grounds, the death

of the king, it might have been expected, would have put an end to the litigations of the lower house, a new clamour was excited, and a new question was started. That part of the lower house which had set up unprecedented claims, were taught to call themselves a parliamentary body, or to consider themselves at least as an appendage to the Parliament, by virtue of the *premunientes* clause to meet in parliament. This point was moved by the Earl of Rochester in the House of Lords ; but the judges were all decided in an opinion that the convocation was dissolved by the king's death, as it was called by a different writ, and had a different constitution from those of the parliament. Disappointed on this plea, they who were eager to carry their point, and to perpetuate the sitting of the convocation, had recourse to another measure. They solicited their friends in the House of Lords to introduce into some Parliamentary Act a clause to revive the dead convocation, and to declare it still in being. " This clause of giving *resurrection*," says Archbishop Tennison, " was thought so extraordinary, that the majority of the peers could not be reconciled to it, and the Attorney-General declared that it was against the queen's ecclesiastical supremacy ; on which they were obliged to relinquish their object, and to acquiesce in the dissolution of the convocation."* " Amidst contentions," says a modern historian, " at once fierce and frivolous, the proceedings and debates of this convocation,

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 613—619. Tennison's Life, p. 92—101. Burnet, book v. p. 89, 90.

“ like all other clerical fynods, were characterised
“ by inexpressible malignity and folly; but being
“ happily divested of every civil power, they knit
“ their darkened brows and gnashed their teeth
“ in vain.”*

The dispute concerning the “ rights, powers, and
“ privileges of convocations,” which was carried
on, at that period, with great violence and mutual
animosities, though it seems now to be almost for-
gotten, did then greatly attract the notice of the
public; warmly engaged the attention and raised the
passions of the nation; produced zealous partizans on
each side of the questions which were agitated in the
respective houses; and employed in acrimonious
attacks on one another those pens, which would,
with more credit to the writers, and with greater
benefit to religion, have been used against the
enemies of revelation and protestantism. The
ecclesiastical corps of the nation were in the state
of a house or a kingdom divided against itself.
The clergy viewed the claims of the bishops with a
spirit of opposition, jealousy, and disdain. The
prelates complained that “ the hot and eager disputes
“ of the lower house of convocation had risen to
“ higher degrees of disrespect and invasion of the
“ metropolitan and episcopal rights than were ever
“ attempted before; and that they had thereby
“ given a greater blow to the church, than it had
“ ever received since the presbyterian assembly in
“ the late times of confusion.”† The dispute was,

* Belsham's History, vol. ii. p. 98.

† Id.

however, at that time a matter of great importance, and well deserving a diligent examination. “Even
“controversies,” as a candid writer remarks,
“which afterwards are to be regarded as insignifi-
“cant, have their utility. They serve to explode
“errors and claims which are hurtful to the interests
“of truth and liberty. And if, which is no impos-
“sible case, similar errors and claims should, in
“the revolution of things, again be obtruded upon-
“the world, we know where to apply for the
“materials and arguments by which they may be
“refuted.”* One important reflection offers itself
from the review of these altercations; it is this,—
that they could not have arisen, had not the pro-
fession of Christianity been incorporated with the
state; had not the followers, especially the ministers,
of Christ, violated that express authoritative decision
against all usurpation of power over one another,
which he laid down; when noticing the exercise of
dominion, and the subordinations of power practised
in the world, he declared, “But it shall not be so
“among you; but whosoever will be great among
“you, let him be your minister; and whosoever
“will be chief among you, let him be your servant.”
And when he delivered this principle of mutual
service and equality, “All ye are brethren.”†

The disputes that originated in the two houses
of convocation, opened a large field of controversy.
Many books and pamphlets were published on both

* Dr. Kippis’s Biog. Britan. vol. i. p. 345.

† Matt. ch. xx. 25—27, 28.

sides ; and discussion on the questions to which it gave rise, was kept alive for five years from the first publication in 1697, previously to the debates which we have stated, till the dissolution of the convocation in 1702 ; and in some subsequent years new publications, which owed their origin to new circumstances, issued from the press. The principal writers in this controversy were Dr. Binckes,† Dr. Wake, Mr. Atterbury, Dr. Kennet, Dr. Edw. Hody, Dr. Edm. Gibson, and Dr. George Hooper.

The controversy opened from the press in 1697, in a quarto pamphlet, entitled “ a Letter to a Convocation Man, concerning the rights, powers, and privileges of Convocations ; ” which, though anonymous, was ascribed to Dr. Binckes. In this tract it was asserted that the convocation was as much a part of the constitution as a parliament itself. It was represented as a spiritual parliament, and the lower house was called “ the commons spiritual.” Dr. Wake, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, in the same year took up his pen, as respondent to the author of the “ Letter ; ” and published his book, entitled, “ The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods.” The aim of the author was to prove that the right of calling the clergy together rested solely in the prince ; that without his permission they had no right, when

† Dr. Binckes was vicar of Leamington in Warwickshire, and dean of Lichfield : he died 19th June 1712. A sermon, which he preached before the House of Commons, 29th Jan. 1702, incurred censure, according to the course of the ecclesiastical courts.—See Atterbury’s Epistolary Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 71, 72.

assembled, to debate or determine any point of doctrine or discipline; that he might annul, alter, or suspend the execution of any of their decrees; and that this consent was necessary to the dissolution of any synod. This publication called forth, in 1700, the celebrated treatise of Mr. Atterbury, afterwards bishop of Rochester, on “The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, stated and vindicated; in answer to a late book of Dr. Wake’s, entitled, ‘the Authority of Christian Princes, &c.’ and several other pieces,” 8vo. This book appeared at first without the author’s name; but his name was prefixed to the second edition, accompanied with many additions. “In this performance, wherever the truth of the question may be supposed to lie, he displayed so much learning and ingenuity, as well as zeal for the interests of his order, that the lower house of convocation returned him their thanks; and the University of Oxford complimented him with the degree of doctor in divinity.”* Dr. Wake, his adversary, allowed that he had “done all that a man of forward parts and a hearty zeal could do to defend the cause which he had espoused. He has chosen,” continues Dr. Wake, “the most plausible topics of argumentation, and has given them all the advantage that either a sprightly wit or a good assurance could afford them. But he wanted one thing: he had not *truth* on his side.” His other antagonists likewise allowed him the full merit of his wit and ingenuity,

* Biograph. Britan. vol. i. p. 336.

though they denied the solidity of his arguments, and condemned the spirit in which he wrote. Bishop Burnet resolved the high encomiums bestowed on the book and the honours which it secured to its author, into their true cause; a cause, independent of the intrinsic excellence of the work, or the force of its reasoning. “The clergy hoped,” says the bishop, “to recover many lost privileges by the help of his performances; they fancied they had a right to be a part of the parliament, so they looked on him as their champion, and on most of the bishops as the betrayers of the rights of the church. This was encouraged by the new ministry; they were displeased with the bishops for adhering to the old ministry; and they hoped by the terror of a convocation to have forced the prelates to apply to them for a shelter.”†

Dr. Kennet, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, entered the lists with Mr. Atterbury, in his “Ecclesiastical Synods and Ecclesiastical Convocations in the Church of England historically stated, and justly vindicated from the misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury:” (part 1. 1701, 8vo.) “Who,” says Burnet, “was by Dr. Kennet laid so open, not only in many particulars, but in a thread of ignorance that ran through his whole book, that if he had not had a measure of confidence peculiar to himself, he must have been much humbled under it.”† Dr. Wake also took up his pen a second time in defence of his own performance, and

† Burnet, book v. p. 36.

† Id.

in reply to that of Mr. Atterbury, in a folio volume, entitled, "The State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other public assemblies, historically deduced from the conversion of the Saxons to the present times," 1703. The learned Dr. Hody was not silent while the questions concerning the rights of the convocation were agitated, but published, in 1701, "A History of English Councils and Convocations, and of the Clergy's sitting in Parliament, &c." 1701.

Mr. Atterbury, it appears, affected to disregard these answers to his work; and ascribed the time of their appearance, and the strain by which they were respectively distinguished, to art and management; for he wrote thus to a friend on the occasion: "When you come to town, you will be entertained with answers of all sorts to my book. Dr. Hody has one just upon the point of coming out, in two thick octavo volumes of about twenty sheets of paper, which he calls 'An History of Convocations.' Another gentleman (Dr. Kennet) has, by order, wrote and printed a good part of another: his is to be about two or three hundred pages, and is to be a first part only, two more being to follow; and this gentleman is ordered to use me rudely, and to put as much gall as he can into his ink. Dr. Hody is to be in the meek way. The design of both is to open the convocation with a clamour against the book, just at the nick of its meeting; so that I shall not be able to answer.

“After all Dr. Wake is to come, when the convocation is up, with a mighty folio. Under all this threatening news, I thank God I am in heart.”*

The work of Dr. Wake, to which Mr. Atterbury refers, was published in 1703, and was entitled, “The State of the Church and Clergy of England, in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other public assemblies, historically displayed from the conversion of the Saxons to the present time; occasioned by a book entitled, ‘The Rights, Powers, and Privileges, &c.’” Dr. Gibson, afterwards bishop of London, then chaplain to the archbishop, exerted himself to the utmost in defence of the contested rights of the primate, and published no fewer than ten pamphlets, in vindication of his claims of right to prorogue the lower as well as upper house of convocation, in the space of three years.* Dr. Hooper, the prolocutor, was not silent on the subject, but defended the other side of the question in a “Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation, relating to prorogations and adjournments, from Monday Feb. 10, 1700, to Wednesday June 25, 1701.” Drawn up by the order of the house: 4to. To this succeeded a number of publications by both parties, which it would be tiresome to enumerate.† The press may

* Atterbury’s Epistolary Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 18, 19.

* British Biography, vol. viii. p. 207—8.

† The reader is referred for a full review of several of the principal publications, to which the controversy about the rights and privileges of convocations gave birth, to Dr. Calamy’s Abridgment, vol. i, p. 554, 560, 562, 564, 567, 570, 583, 602, 609, 610, 618.

be truly said to have groaned under the various and successive publications which this controversy produced.

It deserves notice, that Bishop Warburton, advertising to this controversy, and especially to Dr. Atterbury's book, expresses himself as being very much in the dark as to the expediency of these convocational meetings, and on the benefit to religion accruing from them. "As to that part of the convocation's office which is supposed to consist in watching over the *faith and principles* of the people, I should question," says his lordship, "if it would have any good effect. Bad books might be censored; good ones might too. Burnet's '*Exposition*,' I find, was fulminated; and had the convocation been as busy twenty years ago, as Dr. Atterbury would have it, I should have been in pain for the '*Divine Legation*.'"

"But suppose," he adds, "were their censures ever so just and reasonable, would they do any good? I doubt, in such a country as ours, they would but whet the appetite of readers, and be the means of circulating them into more hands. In short I do not see that much service could arise to religion from the authoritative condemnation of books, unless where great penalties were to follow, which cannot be, except in the case of writers who strike at the very foundations of government.

And for a minute enumeration of the many books and pamphlets which it occasioned, to the *Biographia Britannica*, 2d ed. vol. i. 335, note 1; and to p. 345, 346, for a catalogue of them arranged into four classes from Bishop Nicholson's *Historical Library*.

“ And against books of this malignity, the state will
 “ always exert itself to purpose.

“ The conclusion is, the convocation, by giving
 “ up their old right of taxing themselves, seem to
 “ have given up their right of meeting and debating.
 “ At least, it is no wonder the government should
 “ incline to this side; for let what will be said of
 “ freedom of debate in popular councils, no govern-
 “ ment, I doubt, is heartily for it, but where it
 “ cannot with any safety or convenience be avoided.”*

SECTION II.

The Trinitarian Controversy.

SOON after the Revolution, the public mind was agitated by various publications on the questions that owe their origin to the doctrine of the Trinity; a doctrine ever involved in intricacies by abstruse, metaphysical, and indefinite terms. In 1690, the learned mathematician, Dr. John Wallis, Savilian professor of geometry in Oxford, who professed to have paid a studious attention to the subject for more than forty years, offered to the public a pamphlet, entitled, “ The Doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity
 “ explained.” His explanation amounted to this, that the blessed Trinity was three *somerwhats*, commonly called “ *persons*; but the true notion and

* Letters from a late eminent Prelate to one of his Friends, 8vo, p. 310, 11, 12. 1809.

“ true name of that distinction,” he said, “ are unknown to us. The word *persons*, when applied to God, is but metaphorical; not signifying just the same as when applied to men.” This tract engaged the author for that and the following year in a controversy with the Unitarians; nor were the Trinitarians more satisfied than they were, with an explanation which explained nothing. In 1691, there issued from the press a new edition of several tracts written by Mr. John Biddle, first published in 1648, and reprinted in 1653. Another publication of the same year was “ A Brief History of the Unitarians, called also *Socinians*; in four letters to a friend.” Dr. Sherlock, who had the character of being a polite, clear, and strong writer, and who, by his writings against popery in the former reign, had obtained great reputation, took up his pen, this year, on the Trinitarian question, in “ A Vindication of the doctrine of the holy and ever-blessed Trinity;” in which he expressly asserted, that the three persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite minds or spirits, and three individual substances; two of these issuing from the Father; and that these three are one by a mutual consciousness. This tract was intended as an answer to the “ Brief History of the Unitarians.” A defence of that history against Dr. Sherlock’s answer soon appeared. Another reply to his tract was published under the title of “ Some Thoughts upon Dr. Sherlock’s Vindication of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, in a letter. 4to.” Observations on it were an-

nexed to a tract in 4to. entitled “The Acts of Great Athanasius; with notes, by way of illustration on his Creed.” In this tract the doctor was charged with reviving paganism by such an explication of the Trinity, as undeniably introduced tritheism, or the doctrine of three gods; an error condemned by the ancients in the person of Philoponus; in the middle ages, in the person and writings of Abbot Joachim; but more severely, since the Reformation, in the person of Valentinus Gentilis, who for this very doctrine was condemned at Geneva, and beheaded at Berne. It was generally acknowledged that Dr. Sherlock had exceeded all proper bounds; and his friends used their influence to engage him to be silent in future. He had given the Unitarians such an advantage, that politicians feared the issue of a war, the beginnings of which had been so inauspicious. For some time a stop was put to the publication of any sermons or tracts written against that sect. The language held between the champions of what is called the orthodox faith was, that being masters of all the pulpits, they could sufficiently dispose the people to receive and adhere to that belief without the aid of printed answers and replies; and that they need not trouble themselves about the Socinians. §

Several years before, the very learned Dr. Cudworth, in his elaborate performance, entitled, “The Intellectual System,” had expressed the same

§ Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, written by a person of quality; in 4to. 1693. p. 12.

apprehensions concerning the three divine persons, as Doctor Sherlock advanced : they both apprehended the three persons to be as distinct and different, and as really three several intelligent beings and substances, as three angels, or as Peter, James, and John are. Dr. Cudworth professed to follow, in accounting for the doctrine of the Trinity, the platonic philosophers; with whom he said the orthodox fathers perfectly agreed. He contended, that the unity or sameness of substance of the three divine persons consisted not in *number*, but in *kind* or *nature* : he represented the Son and Spirit, however, as in every way inferior to the Father. He did not allow them to be omnipotent in any other respect than *externally* ; i. e. because the Father concurrereth omnipotently to all their external actions, whether of creation or providence. He desired to distinguish his explication from all others of the moderns by this mark ; that it allowed not the three persons to be, in any respect but duration, *coequal*. For he said, “ three distinct intelligent natures or
“ essences, each pre-eternal, self-existent, and equally
“ omnipotent *ad intra*, are of necessity three Gods ;
“ but if only the first person be indeed internally
“ omnipotent, and the other two subordinate in
“ authority and power to him, you leave them but
“ one God, only in three divine persons.”* Though

* Considerations on the explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, 1693; p. 13, 14. The correspondence of Dr. Cudworth's sentiments with Plato, or their origin in the platonic philosophy, has been examined in the Theological Repository, vol. iv. p. 77, 97. Priestley's early opinions, vol. i. p. 349.

Dr. Cudworth and Dr. Sherlock appear to have been of the same opinion concerning the three divine persons, each conceiving of them as three several intelligences; it seems that the former learned writer did not entertain the same idea concerning their unity, which the latter afterwards advanced: for he called the union of will and affection only a moral union, not a physical or real unity; as three *human* persons would be three distinct men, notwithstanding the moral union in affection and will, so also three divine persons would be three distinct Gods, notwithstanding such an union in will and affection.*

Not long after the Revolution, the civil power interfered in theological debates, and converted what ought to have been considered only as fair discussion in order to ascertain and discover truth, into an offence against the community, and regarded it as the ground of a criminal charge. In 1693 was published a Treatise, entitled, “A brief but clear “Confutation of the Doctrine of the Trinity.” It was industriously dispersed, and copies of it under cover were directed to several peers, and to some members of the House of Commons. The attention of the legislature being called to it, their prejudices were awakened, and their fears of the spread of the sentiments it defended were alarmed. The House of Lords voted it to be an infamous and scandalous libel; it was ordered to be burnt in Old Palace-yard by the hands of the common hangman; an

* Considerations, &c. p. 14.

enquiry after the author, printer, and publisher was instituted ; and the attorney-general was directed to prosecute them.†

But notwithstanding the prosecutions to which, as in this instance, the publication of tracts in favour of Unitarian sentiments was exposed, and the discountenance given to sermons and tracts directed against such opinions, after a temporary pause the Trinitarian controversy was revived. In 1693, Dr. South, rector of Ilip in Oxfordshire, a man of great talents and learning, but of a violent and domineering temper, attacked Dr. Sherlock's book on the Trinity in "Animadversions on it, together with a more necessary vindication of that sacred and prime article of the Christian faith from Dr. Sherlock's new notions and false explications of it: humbly offered to his admirers, and to himself the chief of them." "This pamphlet was written," says Bishop Burnet, "not without wit and learning, but without any measure of Christian charity; and without any regard either to the dignity of the subject or the decencies of his profession."* Dr. South explained the doctrine in the common method, that the Deity was one essence and three subsistencies. In 1694, Dr. Sherlock published a defence of himself against the "Animadversions;" and charged his opponent with Sabellianism. Dr. South replied in a treatise, entitled, "Tritheism charged upon

† 15 Lords' Journal, 332, 3d Jan. 1693. History of William III. vol. ii. p. 381. Proceedings of the House of Lords in the case of Benjamin Flower, p. 37, 38.

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 311

“ Dr. Sherlock’s new notion of the Trinity, “ and the charge made good in answer to the “ defence.” Others went into the dispute with some learning, but with more warmth; and great men espoused the side of each. Dr. Sherlock was accused of polytheism, or holding the doctrine of *three Gods*; and with great justice, if words have any meaning. Dr. South came under the imputation of explaining away the Trinity, and falling into Sabellianism. The candid enquirer was unsettled and perplexed. He hesitated between the scheme of the former, which preserved a Trinity, but in which the Unity was lost; and that of the latter, which under the terms “ modes, subsistencies, and properties, &c.” kept up the “ divine Unity, but then lost “ a Trinity, such as the scriptures discover, at least “ with respect to the Father and the Son.”* The Unitarians, availing themselves of Dr. South’s explanation, declared a readiness to assent to the liturgy and articles, if that was the kind of Trinity which the language of both was intended to circulate.†

Sentiments similar to those of Dr. Sherlock, so far at least as related to the distinction of persons, were advanced by an eminent divine among the dissenters, Mr. Howe; but he did not adopt Dr. Sherlock’s idea of mutual consciousness as constituting the unity of the three divine persons; because that hypothesis left out, according to his expression, the *nexus*, or the connection by which they were united. His

* Emlyn’s Works, vol. i. p. 15.

† Lindsey’s Apology, p. 73. 4th ed.

leading principles were, “that the persons in the
 “Trinity are distinct numerical natures, beings, and
 “substances; that there is a variety of individual
 “natures in the Deity; that there are in the God-
 “head three distinct intelligent hypostases or persons,
 “having each his own distinct, singular, intelligent
 “nature; and these three divine persons, beings,
 “essences, natures, substances, maintain a *delicious*
 “*society*. No enjoyments being pleasant without
 “*consociation* therein: and we must needs think this
 “a most blessed state, or a more perfect idea of blef-
 “sedness, than can be conceived in an eternal soli-
 “tude.” This, it has been observed, is Dr.
 Sherlock’s doctrine; only with some more gross
 ideas and additions to it.† Mr. Howe’s tract was

† Unitarian Tracts, in 4to. 1695, p. 39, 40, vol. iii. This idea, gross as it may appear to some, was, in a short time after it was broached in a metaphysical disquisition, converted into a theme of devotional declamation by Mr. after Dr. Watts; and at the distance of twenty years, when he himself made an apology for having been carried away by the warm efforts of imagination further than riper years would probably indulge on so sublime and abstruse a subject, was delivered from the press in a sermon entitled, “The Scale of
 “Blessedness; or blessed Saints, blessed Saviour, and blessed Trinity;” from Ps. lxxv. 4. Having dwelt upon the thought, that knowledge and mutual love make up the heaven of the three divine persons, the pious author, borne away by a heated imagination, and lost in his subject, concludes it in this rapturous strain: “The
 “nearness of the divine persons to each other, and the unspeakable
 “relish of their unbounded pleasures, are too vast ideas for our
 “bounded minds to entertain. ’Tis one infinite transport that runs
 “through Father, Son, and Spirit, without beginning and without
 “end, with boundless variety, yet ever perfect and ever present,
 “without change and without degree; and all this, because they
 “are so near with one another, and so much one with God.” Sermons on various subjects, vol. i. No. xii. or p. 399, 12mo. ed. 1721.

entitled, “ A calm and sober Inquiry concerning the
“ possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead; in a letter
“ to a person of worth.” To which were added some
letters formerly written to Dr. Wallis, on the same
subject. 1694. Notwithstanding the prominent fea-
ture of agreement in the hypotheses of the two divines,
Mr. Howe fell under the censure of Dr. Sherlock,
as advancing such a notion of the unity of God as
neither the scriptures nor the ancient church knew
any thing of, and as scarcely needing a confutation.
Yet he offered animadversions on it in his defence
against Dr. South. It was also noticed in “ Some
“ Considerations on the explications of the Doctrine
“ of the Trinity, in a letter to H. H.” To both
Mr. Howe replied; to the former in a “ Letter to a
“ Friend;” and to the latter, in “ A View of those
“ Considerations,” in a letter to the friend whom
he had before addressed. In this performance, with
a fairness and liberality that did him much credit,
he gave it “ as his judgment, that much service
“ might be done to the common interest of religion,
“ by a free mutual communication of even more
“ more doubtful thoughts, if such disquisitions were
“ pursued with more candour, and with less confi-
“ dence and prepossession of mind, or addictedness
“ to the interest of any party. If it were rather
“ endeavoured to reason one another into or out
“ of this or that opinion, than either by sophistical
“ conclusions to cheat, or to hector by great
“ words, one that is not of our mind. Or if the
“ design were less to expose an adversary, than to

“ clear the matter in controversy. Besides, that
“ if such equanimity did more generally appear and
“ govern in transactions of this nature, it would
“ produce a greater liberty in communicating our
“ thoughts about some of the more vogued and
“ fashionable opinions, by exempting each other
“ from the fear of ill treatment in the most sensible
“ kind. It being too manifest that the same confi-
“ dent insulting genius which makes a man think
“ himself to be competent to be a standard to man-
“ kind, would also make him impatient of dissent,
“ and tempt him to do worse than reproach one
“ that differs from him, if it were in his power.
“ And the club or faggot arguments must be ex-
“ pected to take place, where what he thinks rational
“ ones did not do the business.” Mr. Howe by his
publications in this controversy rose in esteem and
respect with some; others, who highly valued his
other publications, wished that he had left this ar-
gument untouched; a third set could scarcely refrain
from charging him, as well as Dr. Sherlock, with
heresy; a term, by which those who use it assume to
themselves orthodoxy and infallibility, and fix a
stigma on such as differ from them.*

In the church, Dr. Sherlock's sentiments found
advocates as well as opponents. On the feast of
St. Simon and Jude in 1695, Mr. Bingham, rector
of Headbourn-Worthy, near Winchester, and a
fellow of University college in Oxford, afterwards
eminent for his laborious investigations and learned

* Calamy's Life of Howe, p. 198—209.

publications on the antiquities of the christian church, and for his meritorious services in behalf of the establishment to which he belonged, advanced, in a sermon before the university, the notions of Dr. Sherlock; and asserted that “there were three infinite distinct minds and substances in the Trinity;” and also that the three persons in the Trinity were “three distinct minds or spirits, and three individual substances.” They who patronised and embraced the sentiments of Dr. South were offended with these assertions; and had sufficient influence to procure a solemn decree in convocation, judging, declaring, and determining “the aforesaid words to be false, impious, and heretical; disagreeing with and contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic church, and especially to the doctrine of the Church of England publicly received.” The realists, instead of yielding to the decision and sentence of the convocation, entered a virtual protest against it; and answered, that “what the heads of Oxford had condemned as heretical and impious, was the very Catholic faith: that the decree was a censure of the Nicene faith, and of the faith of the Church of England, as heresy; and exposed both to the scorn and triumph of the Socinians.” Dr. Sherlock in particular said, “that he would undertake, any day in the year, to procure a meeting of twice as many wise and learned men to censure their decree.”*

* Ben Mordecai's Letters, vol. i. p. 70. 8vo. ed.

Under these circumstances, neither the authority of the university, nor the solemnity with which the decree was issued, could secure the end proposed by it. It rather irritated the parties, than settled their differences. Dr. Tennison, who then filled the see of Canterbury, prevailed with the king to interpose by his authority, and to give the royal sanction to certain injunctions drawn up by himself, and addressed to the arch bishops and bishops, to be published in their dioceses, and enforced by their episcopal authority, to maintain the purity of the Christian faith, and preserve the peace of the church. The proclamation directed,

That no preacher whatsoever in his sermon or lecture should presume to deliver any other doctrine concerning the blessed Trinity, than what was contained in the Holy Scriptures, and is agreeable to the three creeds and the thirty-nine articles of religion.

That in the explication of this doctrine they should carefully avoid all new terms, and confine themselves to such ways of explication as have been commonly used in the church.

The careful observance of the 53d canon, which prohibits public opposition between preachers, and especially bitter invectives and scurrilous language against all persons whatever, was particularly recommended. These rules were also enjoined on all who wrote on the disputed questions. These directions were not limited to the clergy alone to govern their conduct in the controversy, but were also levelled at

those who were not of the clerical body, but who, it was understood, had presumed to talk and dispute against the Christian faith concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, or had written or published or dispersed books and pamphlets against it : And the clergy were strictly charged and commanded, together with all other means suitable to their holy profession, to use their authority according to law to repress and restrain such exorbitant practices.*

No decree of a council, no bull of a pope, could be more decidedly marked by claims to authority over conscience, and to infallibility of judgment in the enactors of either, than were these royal injunctions drawn up by an episcopal pen. The royal personage from whose court they were given, and the prelate whose spirit dictated them, though credit should be given to the purity of their motives, forgot that they were protestants. The only part of these injunctions that could possibly answer a valuable end, and that properly fell within the province of the civil magistrate, was the order to abstain from bitter invectives and scurrilous language. The other directions tended only to overbear the judgments of men, to suppress conviction, and to restrain inquiry.

The decree of the university and the injunctions of the king were not merely dead letters. The partizans of orthodoxy in that day not only had recourse to censures, but adopted vigorous measures. In 1695 was published a tract, reprinted by the London Unitarian Society in 1793, entitled "The

* Tennyson's Life, p. 49--53.

“ designed End to the Socinian Controversy ; or a
 “ rational and plain Discourse to prove that no other
 “ person but the Father of Christ is God Most
 “ High :” by Mr. John Smith. “ The author
 “ discovers,” says the editor of the modern edition,
 “ a very considerable acquaintance with the Christian
 “ scriptures, and a mind influenced by the love of
 “ truth.” These recommendations did not screen
 him or his work from resentment and the visita-
 tion of power. The work was seized, and the
 author was apprehended.* Dr. Trelawney, while
 bishop of Exeter, entered the lists with peculiar
 spirit against those who were deemed to be engaged
 in a conspiracy against the catholic faith, viz. Soci-
 nians, latitudinarians, and deniers of the mysteries;
 and he proceeded to the extreme measure of excom-
 municating Dr. Bury, who had been also solemnly
 condemned by the universities for notorious heresy.†

By these means the Trinitarian controversy had
 at last a temporary suspension ; but not till the
 leading disputants in it, Dr. Sherlock and Dr. South,
 had been ridiculed in a popular ballad, called
 “ The Battle Royal.”§ The various modes adopted

* Preface to the last edition.

† A Letter to a Convocation Man, 1697 ; ascribed to Dr.
 Binckes. N. B. In a copy of this tract in Dr. Williams’s Library,
 Red-Cross-street, London, the names of Trelawney and Bury are
 inserted in the margin ; as one the actor, the other the sufferer.

§ This ballad was translated into several languages, particularly
 the Latin, by a curious hand, at the University of Cambridge ;
 and presents were made to the author by the nobility and gentry.
 The ludicrous strain of it, which was very indecorous, considering

for suppressing the works of the Unitarians occasioned one§ who had written with acrimony against the friends of the Revolution, to remark “ that cer-

the eminent and learned persons whom it reprimands, and the gravity of the questions debated by the disputants, is a proof that the dispute was regarded as the contention of theologues rather than as the sober investigation of sacred and important truth ; and did not procure from all persons respect to the divines concerned in it. As it is a document that shews the spirit of the times, and the impression made by the controversy on the public mind, it may be acceptable to the reader.

“ THE BATTLE ROYAL,”

To the tune of “ *A Soldier and a Sailor.*”

A dean* and a prebendary†
Had once a vagary ;
And were at doubtful strife, fir,
Who led the better life, fir,
And was the better man.

The dean, he said, that truly
Since BLUFF was so unruly,
He’d prove it to his face, fir,
That he had the most grace, fir,
And so the fight began, &c.

When PREB replied, like thunder,
And roar’d out, it was no wonder,
Since Gods the dean had THREE, fir,
And more by two than he, fir :
For he had got but one, &c.

Now, while these two were raging,
And in dispute engaging,
The Master of the CHARTER‡
Said both had caught a tartar,
For gods, fir, there were none, &c.

That all the books of Moses
Were nothing but supposes ;
That he deserved rebuke, fir,
Who wrote the Pentateuch, fir ;
’Twas nothing but a sham, &c.

That as for Father Adam,
With Mrs. Eve, his madam,
And what the serpent spake, fir,
’Twas nothing but a joke, fir,
And well-invented flam, &c.

That in the BATTLE ROYAL,
As none could take denial,
The dame for which they strove, fir,
Could neither of them love, fir,
Since all had given offence, &c.

She therefore, slyly waiting,
Left all THREE FOOLS a prating ;
And being in a fright, fir,
RELIGION took her flight, fir
And ne’er was heard of since.‡

* Dr. Sherlock.

† Dr. South.

‡ Dr. Thomas Burnet, master of the Charter-House, who about this time published his *Archæologia* ; in which he was charged by some with having impugned and weakened the divine truths of the Old Testament.

‡ South’s *Posthumous Works*, *Memoirs*, p. 128,--130.

§ Dr. Hickes.

“ tainly there must be something formidable in
“ their books and some reasonings in them, which
“ could not be well answered, that so much dili-
“ gence was used to suppress them.”||

SECTION III.

The Controversy about Justification.

THE dissenters had scarcely begun to enjoy peace, protection, and liberty, under the auspicious influence of the Revolution, than they disagreed among themselves. Division and dissention, always to be lamented, were in several views, at that time, particularly disgraceful and unseasonable. They furnished those who had predicted their disunion, if they were left to themselves, an opportunity of insulting and reproaching them. While the flames were breaking out in the Established Church, occasioned both by religious and practical animosities, if the dissenters had been wise and temperate enough to preserve harmony and union among themselves, they would have secured honour to their principles, preserved the consistency of their character as protestants, and acquired respectability and weight in the state. It had been presumed, that a foundation

|| Preface to the late edition of Smith's Divine End, &c. p. vi.

for a permanent union had been laid, and that a cement of their mutual interests had been formed, by the heads of agreement, to which the body of the ministers, both presbyterian and congregational, in London and its vicinity, and in several parts of the country, had assented in 1691.* But strange as it may appear, the rise of their differences may be dated, it is said, from that agreement. Some few of the congregational denomination never either approved of those heads of agreement, or concurred in the union. They were not satisfied, moreover, with refusing their consent to the union, and preserving their own independency ; but were assiduous in using their influence with their brethren, who entertained the same sentiments with themselves on certain doctrinal points, and had joined the union, to detach them from it ; and they gave them no rest till this end was affected. The influence of the united ministers in London, on account of some differences and animosities to which the opinions broached by Mr. Davis, of Rothwell in Northamptonshire, had given rise, contributed on their side to heighten the dissatisfaction of the others, to widen the breach, and to precipitate a rupture. “ They “ acted,” says Dr. Calamy, “ as if they had been “ under the secret influence of some who were fearful “ while the Established Church was divided, lest “ their own interest should gain a firm and permanent union.” It had been observed in Germany, that “ the book of concord,” as a plan of union

* See before, p. 99.

was called, was the occasion of great discord ; so the attempted union among the dissenters was the occasion of new quarrels and divisions.”*

Mr. Davis, of Rothwell, incurred the censure of his brethren in the neighbourhood for erroneous principles and irregular practices. The errors charged on him were these : “ That the law of innocency
“ was not able to save men at first : That justification
“ upon believing is only a manifestation to the con-
“ science of an antecedent justification ; and so it
“ is not the state of the soul, but its sense of its
“ state, that is altered upon conversion : That jus-
“ tifying faith is a persuasion that our sins are
“ pardoned ; and when it is said we believe for
“ pardon, it is meant for the knowledge of pardon :
“ That this faith is not a consenting act of the will :
“ That the law prepares not for conversion, and its
“ convictions tend to drive men farther from Christ :
“ That the law of the gospel is the great law of
“ electing grace, viz. I will have mercy on whom I
“ will have mercy : That there be no preparatory
“ humblings in order to faith : That we should begin
“ our religion with high confidence of our interest
“ in Christ, and must maintain it against all chal-
“ lenges or doubts from our sins or defects : That
“ they are like Baal’s priests, who put men on
“ trying themselves by such marks, as sincerity,
“ universal obedience, love to God and Christ
“ and the brethren : That all believers at all times
“ stand before God without sin ; yea, when they are

* Calamy, p. 512, 537. Howe’s Life, p. 181, 182.

“ sinning against God, they are without spot before
“ God ; and when they have sinned and prayed
“ for pardon, it is for the discovery thereof to their
“ conscience, and not for what is properly forgive-
“ nefs : That Christ fulfilled the covenant of grace
“ for us, and he believed for us, as our re-
“ presentative.”

On the subject of irregular practices, Mr. Davis was accused of sending forth preachers unfit for the ministry, and not approved by neighbouring ministers ; of unchurching such churches as did not agree with his exorbitant methods and licentious principles ; of wickedly railing at most of the orthodox laborious ministers, endeavouring to the utmost to prejudice the people against their persons and labours, as idolatrous, illegal, and antichristian ; yea, of affirming that all the churches had gone a whoring from Christ, and that he was happy who was the instrument of breaking all the churches. He was particularly pressed, in one point, with a charge of holding an horrid opinion, and observing an unchristian practice : it was, that though he did not scruple to baptize the children of his own people, yet he rebaptized such adult members as were baptized in their infancy by any ministers of the Church of England. Against this charge he defended himself on these grounds ; “ that if
“ any, the seed of strangers, and having no other
“ baptism than that of the public, desired to submit
“ to the ordinance, he dared not to refuse it : for he
“ looked on that administered in public as null and

“ void, on two accounts : first, that they and their un-
“ believing parents being in no sense or wise under
“ the covenant, baptism could not be a seal ; and,
“ if not a seal, he apprehended it to be nothing,
“ and therefore null and void. And secondly, that
“ the administrators were none of Christ’s sending,
“ and that therefore what they did in matters of
“ religion was nothing, as an idol is nothing.”
Mr. Davis argued, “ by parity of reason, ordinances
“ falsely administered are nothing ; and, though
“ baptism was performed by them in the name of
“ the Father, Son, and Spirit ; yet still they pro-
“ phesied lies in the name of the LORD, for He
“ never sent them.” The strain and spirit of this
assertion may be considered as a specimen and a
proof of the charge alleged against Mr. Davis.

This statement of his principles and conduct, formed part of a declaration published by the
“ United Brethren,” at the instigation of the mi-
nisters in the country, to counteract the spread of
his sentiments, and in testimony of their own fidelity
and zeal for the truth of Christ. In this declaration
they expressed their thoughts concerning his doctrines
and practices, and entered their protest against them, as
repugnant to the gospel, to the doctrine of the Church
of England, and to other confessions, to which they
had given their assent. They also stigmatized his
principles, as furnishing “ strong temptations to
“ carnal security and libertinism ; as Satan’s fiery
“ darts, whereby he endeavoureth the ruin of those
“ souls who are less subject to other snares ; and

“ as what would destroy the ministry which Christ
“ hath appointed and prospered to the conversion
“ of sinners.” They disowned Mr. Davis himself,
as neither then nor at any former time esteemed to
be of the number of the united brethren.

The concluding paragraph of this declaration is
strongly expressive of the views and spirit of those
who published it, as to the subject before them.
“ It is our grief,” they say, “ that a man should
“ with meer falsehood, clamour, and noise, prevail
“ so far : It is no less our wonder, that he should
“ generally set up for the only gospel preacher,
“ reviling most others ; and yet when charged with
“ his assertions, he at times attempts, to unintelli-
“ gent persons, to reduce those abominable asser-
“ tions to what is the general opinion of such as he
“ exposeth. But we shall earnestly pray for his
“ repentance ; and in the mean time, that that
“ scripture may be verified in him, 2 Tim. iii. 9.
“ ‘ He shall proceed no further, but his folly shall be
“ manifest to all men :’ which we are encouraged to
“ hope the sudden accomplishment of, since he is
“ given up to such trifling visions, enthusiastic pre-
“ tences, self-contradictions, highest arrogance and
“ insolence, and many are awakened to see the wiles
“ of the Devil by their visible effects ; and most
“ persons fit to judge thereof agree, it cannot be the
“ interest of Christ that he serves, by the spirit he
“ discovers, and the public scandal and mischiefs he
“ so industriously promotes.”*

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 512—514.

The reader will judge how far the air of infallibility, and the tone of authority, which such a declaration carries in it, are calculated to convince or to conciliate. It is certain, that this paper had not the effect which it was meant to produce. Discontents existed among the united brethren themselves, and a difference of opinion about some doctrinal points soon discovered itself on an occasion which their sagacity could not anticipate, nor their influence prevent.

During the unhappy times of the civil wars, the subject of Justification had been warmly controverted by writers of the several religious parties : who disagreed in their ideas on the meaning, not of the word "*justification*" only, but of the terms "*faith*" and "good works," and in their construction of the language of the apostles Paul and James on this subject. Contests were started, that could have no object but to divide and alienate: various hypotheses were formed, which obscured the points that they were meant to elucidate: and the sense of the apostolical writers was perplexed by abundance of learned sophistry. Some who appeared in this controversy were censured as leaning to popery or judaism; others were regarded as advocates of antinomianism and libertinism; some again were charged with pelagianism and socinianism; and others, lastly, were considered as advancing the principles of manichæism and fatalism. The questions connected with this controversy had been agitated, with much contention, for about twenty years, when they attracted the attention of Mr. afterwards Bishop Bull; then

26 years of age, and engaged his close enquiries and assiduous study during eight or nine years. The result of his investigation was the publication of a work in Latin, entitled "*Harmonia Apostolica*," *Apostolical Harmony*; consisting of two dissertations, the first to explain and defend the doctrine of James on justification, the second to demonstrate the agreement and harmony of Paul with him on this point. The particular design of the first dissertation was to shew "that good works which proceed from faith, are a necessary condition required from us by God, to the end that by the new and evangelical covenant obtained by and sealed in the blood of Christ, the mediator of it, we may be justified according to his free and unmerited grace."

Though our young divine settled his own judgment, he was not equally successful in his endeavours to bring others to discern and acknowledge the truth of those conclusions on the point, to which he had himself been led by his review of the scriptures and of primitive antiquity: for notwithstanding all his caution in discussing a subject which the disputations of theologians had rendered abstruse, his performance created alarm both in the church and out of it. His interpretations of the sacred writers, and his method of reconciling the two apostles, were tried by the correspondence which they bore to the sentiments of Luther and Calvin, whose names, as the two apostles of the Reformation, carried with them an undue and overbearing

influence. Though the evidence and strength of his arguments appeared to some in a clear and convincing light, hard censures were passed by others on the work and its author; and the doctrines maintained in it were condemned as pernicious and heretical, contrary to the decrees of the Church of England, and of all other reformed churches. Dr. Morley, bishop of Winchester, in a charge to his clergy, prohibited the reading of Mr. Bull's work; some heads of houses in the universities and some tutors warned the students against it. Dr. Barlow, Margaret professor at Oxford, and afterwards bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Tully, principal of Edmund's Hall, an eloquent and learned writer, were the most zealous to oppose the pacific method which it offered in order to reconcile the different systems about attaining salvation. Among the dissenters, Mr. Joseph Truman, educated in the distinguishing doctrines that were ratified by the Westminster Assembly, and Mr. Tombes, a learned baptist minister, animadverted on the "Apostolical Harmony," as if a blow had been aimed by it at the ground-work of the Reformation. About a year after it was published, a copy of it was sent to the author with marginal annotations and animadversions from the hands of his diocesan Dr. Nicholson, bishop of Gloucester; written, it was afterwards discovered, by Mr. Charles Gataker, the son of the learned critic of that name, whose zeal for the principles which he had received, as authentic explications of the gospel, in the systems that he had studied, neither permitted him to think

sedately, nor to write with temper. Dr. Lewis du Moulin, son of the famous Peter du Moulin, an independent, likewise attacked with great severity the principles and opinions advanced by Mr. Bull, in a pamphlet, entitled, “A short and true Account
“ of the several advances the Church of England
“ hath made towards Rome; or a model of the
“ grounds upon which the papists, for these hun-
“ dred years, have built their hopes and expectations
“ that England would ere long return to popery.” London, 1680. This tract contained also virulent reflections on several eminent divines of the Church of England.* The ground of the strain in which this pamphlet and others in this controversy were written, was, that the solifidian doctrine was regarded by many as the main pillar of protestantism; which being once shaken, it was thought, there could be no possibility of its bearing up its head against popery, or of justifying the proceedings of Luther and the other first reformers. With this tract, the controversy, which had been continued for ten years, was terminated: as Mr. Bull did not judge it necessary to reply. He had particularly and fully answered the other writers, who had animadverted on his “Apostolical Harmony.” His

* It ought to be mentioned to the honour of Dr. Moulin, and as a pleasing instance of candour and ingenuoufness, that on his death-bed, soon after the appearance of his pamphlet, he retracted all the personal reflections which he had cast in his book upon any divine of the Church of England; and directed his retraction to be made public after his death. This was accordingly done. Nelson’s Life of Bishop Bull, p. 254.

biographer says, “that with a very laudable
“diligence he spared no pains, that he might tho-
“roughly and impartially examine all that his adver-
“sary could bring against him: nor could it be denied,
“that he made such just and reasonable concessions,
“as rendered his own cause the stronger, while they
“yielded to the opposite that which it might lawfully
“demand.” In the discussions which originated
with his work, the meaning of the terms, “justifica-
“tion, faith, and good works,” was canvassed. The
nature of the Mosaic law, and of its promises and
threatenings, came under examination. These were
proper subjects of enquiry; and the investigation of
them tended to elucidate the scriptures, and to place
the matter in debate on scriptural authority, its just
and only obligatory ground. But with the dis-
cussions on these points were blended systematic
principles and scholastic niceties. It must be added,
to the disgrace of those who wrote in it, though
too much in the spirit of all times and of all
controversies, that their pens were often dipped in
gall, and their arguments were accompanied with
heavy charges and invidious imputations. “The
“best cause in the world may be run down with
“clamour and confidence; but truth is never better
“supported, than by being modestly and simply
“proposed, with the arguments for and against it
“fairly represented, without reflection upon any for
“not thinking after the same manner with us.”*

* For a full, candid, and succinct review of this controversy, see
Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, p. 89—257.

The controversy which was begun in the Established Church, and revived by the publication of Bull's "*Harmonia Apostolica*," was also taken up by the dissenters, and conducted with much warmth. So far back as the year 1649, Mr. Baxter had discussed the questions concerning the doctrine of justification, in a treatise, entitled, "*Aphorisms of Justification and the Covenants*." Exceptions were made to this work at its first appearance. It excited much attention; became a subject of obloquy with many; and several learned men, as Dr. John Wallis, Mr. Geo. Lawson, Mr. John Warren, and Mr. Christopher Cartwright, employed their pens in animadverting upon it. The "*Aphorisms*" were particularly answered by Mr. John Crandon, of Fawley in Hampshire, in a book, which he inscribed, "*Mr. Baxter's Aphorisms exorcised*;" and by Mr. Wm. Eyre, of Salisbury, in his "*Vindiciæ Justificationis gratuitaë*." Some of these writers delivered their sentiments at the desire of Mr. Baxter himself; upon which he published his suspension of these aphorisms; then his fuller explication and defence of them in his "*Apology*;" and afterwards an additional explication and defence of them, in his "*Confession of Faith*," and in his "*Disputations of Justification*." On his part the controversy was agitated, at different times, for forty years. In one of his publications, during this period, he entered the lists with Dr. Tully, one of Bishop Bull's opponents, in "*A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness, in two books*," in 1676. In this work, though

he sometimes acknowledged the doctor to be a very worthy person, yet he hesitated not to charge his “*Justificatio Paulina*” as being “defective in point of truth, justice, charity, ingenuity, and pertinency to the matter.” “It was the unhappiness both of Mr. Baxter and Dr. Tully,” observes Mr. Nelson, “that they gave but too much reason for the imputation, under which they both equally lay, of being angry writers.” Bull, Bellarmin, who also wrote on the same subject, and Baxter, were considered and represented by Dr. Tully as “the three great adversaries of the faith,” engaged in “a triple league” to overthrow it.*

After the controversy, as it had been handled by some writers whom we have mentioned, had subsided, it revived again amongst the dissenters, and seems to have been confined within their pale. It was occasioned by the republication of the works of Dr. Crisp, by his son Mr. Samuel Crisp, sanctioned by the names of several presbyterian and independent ministers. When they were first published, the assembly of divines at Westminster desired them to be burnt. The author was a man of great piety, and exemplary purity of character; but the sentiments that he advanced and defended were, with reason, considered as very pernicious in their tendency, and as opening a door for great licentiousness of manners in those whom their passions might dispose to act upon the strict letter of them.

Dr. Crisp’s scheme is stated to be this : “That by God’s mere electing decree, all saving blessings

* Nelson’s Life of Bull, p. 243—254.

“ are by divine obligation made ours, and nothing
“ more is needful to our title to these blessings :
“ That on the cross all the sins of the elect were
“ transferred to Christ, and ceased ever to be their
“ sins: That at the first moment of conception, a
“ title to these decreed blessings is personally applied
“ to the elect, and they invested actually therein.
“ Hence the elect have nothing to do, in order to an
“ interest in these blessings; nor ought they to intend
“ the least good to themselves in what they do: sin
“ can do them no harm, because it is none of theirs ;
“ nor can God afflict them for any sin.”

On his scheme it was affirmed, “ That sins are not
“ to be feared as doing any hurt, even when the
“ most flagitious are committed. Grace and holiness
“ cannot do us the least good. God has no more
“ to lay to the charge of the wickedest men, if they
“ be elected, than he has to lay to the charge of a
“ saint in glory. That the elect are not to be governed
“ by fear or hope; for the laws have no promises or
“ threats to rule them ; nor are they under the im-
“ pressions of rewards or punishments, as motives to
“ duty, or preservatives against sin.”*

These sentiments were stiled *Antinomian*, as im-
pugning the excellence and subverting the obligations
of the law. They exhibit an overstrained construc-
tion of Luther’s doctrine, which represents the
merits of Christ as the source of man’s salvation; and
of Calvin’s doctrine respecting divine decrees. Were
there not reason to suppose that the advocate for them

* Dr. Williams’s Gospel Truth, p. 6, 7, 8.

was sincere, though misled, one should be ready to impute to him an invidious design to caricature the opinions of those reformers, and to expose them to indignation or contempt. These opinions sprung up in Germany, and were broached by John Agricola, a native of Aisleben, and an eminent doctor of the Lutheran church. His followers were called *Antinomians*, i. e. "Enemies of the law." This sect was suppressed in its infancy by the fortitude, watchfulness, and influence of Luther: and Agricola acknowledged and renounced his pernicious system; though he is said to have returned to his errors, and to have preached them again with success after the death of Luther.*

These opinions had for many years lain dormant in England, when the republication of Dr. Crisp's works in or about 1690 revived them, and gave them a new and wide circulation, especially among the nonconformists, whose liberties were threatened on this account. Under the conduct of Mr. Davis the flame broke out with peculiar violence, and spread through eleven counties. Judicious and faithful ministers, who inculcated the necessity and obligations of righteousness, were deserted, and reproached as legalists; churches were divided, and town and country were filled with debates and noise. So high did the ferment rise, so widely did the infection spread in the city of London, that if a minister among the presbyterians preached a sermon in which hope was placed on conditional promises, or the fear of sin was pressed by

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 33.

the divine threatenings, he was immediately condemned and censured as an enemy to Christ and free grace. This censoriousness and violence of temper shewed itself particularly amongst the independents and baptists. One of the lecturers at Pinner's Hall preaching on repentance as necessary to the remission of sins, that pulpit was soon filled with the harshest censures against the presbyterians.*

Many of the ministers of that persuasion solicited Mr. afterwards Dr. Daniel Williams, to confute the principles of Dr. Crisp. This he undertook to do; and entered on his task first in a sermon at Pinner's Hall; and then in a treatise, entitled, "Gospel Truths stated and vindicated." The method in which this work was drawn up, was to state the *truth* and *error* under each head; to prove the latter to be the opinion of Dr. Crisp; then to shew wherein the difference did not lie; and this being done, to declare in what the real and proper difference did consist. Having thus explained and stated the case, the author confirmed the truth, which was opposed to a specific error, by the rule of faith received by both sides. To the direct proofs were added corroborating testimonies from the approved catechisms and confessions both of the presbyterian and independent body, viz. those of the assembly at Westminster, of the synod of New England, and of the congregational elders at the Savoy, besides those of such particular authors as were generally esteemed orthodox. And, lastly, he investigated the ground of Dr. Crisp's mistake.

* Gospel Truth, preface, p. 27; and Bishop Bull's Life, p. 260.

This plan of discussion was applied to about twenty-six points; it was executed with plainness and simplicity, and matters were stated with such fairness and impartiality, that his adversaries did not detect one instance in which the opinions of the doctor were misrepresented or mistaken.† The author himself declared, that he had carefully avoided any reflection on the Rev. Dr. Crisp; “whom,” he added, “I believe a holy man; and have abstained
“exposing many things according to the advantages
“offered, if by any means this book may become
“useful to such as most need it.”

The points connected with the controversy, and discussed in this treatise, through as many chapters as the propositions amounted to, are “the state of
“the elect before effectual calling: God’s laying sins
“on Christ: the discharge of the elect from sins,
“upon their being laid on Christ: the elect ceasing
“to be sinners from the time their sins were laid on
“Christ: the time when our sins were laid on Christ,
“and continued there: God’s separation from and
“abhorrence of Christ, while our sins lay upon him:
“the change of person between Christ and the elect:
“the nature of saving faith, the free offer of Christ
“to sinners, and of preparatory qualifications;
“union with Christ by faith: justification by faith,
“with a digression about repentance: the necessity
“and benefit of holiness, obedience, and good
“works, with perseverance therein: intending our
“soul’s good by the duties we perform: the way

† Bishop Bull’s Life, p. 261.

“ to attain assurance : GOD’s seeing sins in believers,
 “ and their guilt by it: the hurt that sin may do the
 “ believers: GOD’s displeasure for sin, in the afflic-
 “ tions of his people : the beauty of sincere holiness:
 “ Gospel preaching : legal preaching : exalting of
 “ Christ : the honour of the free grace of GOD.”

Dr. Williams has been considered as Mr. Baxter’s successor in the management of these disputes ; and he incurred the same severe censures as had befallen that eminent writer, being accused of maintaining opinions inconsistent with the doctrine of Christ’s satisfaction, and yielding up the cause to the Socinians. Names that carried an odium with them were very freely bestowed on him; as if it were more the study of the partisans of Dr. Crisp’s opinions to expose those with whom they had the dispute to reproach and obloquy, than to examine their arguments and discover truth.

Dr. Williams’s work was first published in 1692, with testimonials of approbation by Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, Mr. Alsop, Mr. Shower, and twelve other dissenting ministers. The names of double that number were added to the second edition. This was succeeded by a third edition, with other names; to which a large postscript was added, for elucidating sundry truths.||

Dr. Chauncy, and several who coincided with him in opinions, animadverted on Dr. Williams’s per-

|| Mr. Orton recommended the treatise of Dr. Williams as the best that he knew, to enable a person to judge of those controversies. “He is,” Mr. Orton added, “the clearest, fairest controversial writer I am acquainted with.” Letters to a young Clergyman, letter xv.

formance: to whom Dr. Williams replied, in "A Defence of Gospel Truth," a performance which secured the approbation of able judges. But notwithstanding the conviction which it carried to some minds, it did not give the same satisfaction to all. Mr. Mather, an independent minister, published a sermon on justification, in which he asserted that believers were as righteous as Christ himself; that the covenant of grace was not conditional; with other opinions of the same tenor. Dr. Williams answered him in a tract, entitled, "Man made Righteous." To this work no one replied.*

On the publication of Dr. Williams's "Gospel Truth," instead of its serving to compose the differences which had broken out among the lecturers at Pinner's Hall, a new and great clamour was raised; particularly on account of the interpretation given to Phil. iii. 9. At length a paper of objections to that work, signed by Mr. Griffith, Mr. Cole, Mr. Mather, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Trail, and Mr. Richard Taylor, was delivered at a meeting of the united ministers. But no cognizance was taken of it. The reasons of passing it over without notice were, that three of the six objectors were not of the union; and that the material objections were not only considered to be ungrounded, but were expressed in words as recited from Dr. Williams's work, which were quite contrary to the letter of the expressions.† The doctor examined the paper in a postscript to a third edition

* Bishop Bull's Life, p. 262.

† Dr. Williams's Works, vol. iv. p. 322—324.

of his tract, and fully considered the objections it exhibited. But the silence with which the united ministers treated it, gave umbrage; and Dr. Chauncy, at a meeting about October 1692, using many warm words, assigned this neglect as a reason for leaving their meetings, and breaking off from their union. The more candid and pacific studied healing expedients; and after much consideration fixed on certain doctrinal articles, to which both sides agreed and subscribed, Dec. 16, 1692. These were published to the world under the title of "The Agreement in Doctrine among the Dissenting Ministers in London." This paper was far from answering the conciliatory end that was expected from it. The debates continued: one party was suspected of verging towards arminianism, and even socinianism. The charge of encouraging antinomianism was retorted on the other party. Separate weekly meetings were held. New creeds were framed; but they were objected to by some or others "as too large or too strait, too full or too empty." Different papers were drawn up and subscribed, to effect an accommodation: but they created new altercations and fomented new differences. It seemed to be the aim and wish of some, that they might be thought to differ from their brethren, whether they really did so or not. The contending parties, in some instances at least, fancied their mutual differences to be greater than in fact they were. A letter was published in 4to. entitled, "A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine concerning Justification, and of its

“ preachers and professors, from the unjust charge
“ of Antinomianism.” But the hopes of free
brotherly correspondence vanished away.|| “ Such
“ were the effects of these wrangles at that time,”
observes Dr. Calamy, “ upon the most common
“ conversation, and so odd do the controversies that
“ were then managed appear, if reviewed at a
“ distance, as to convince considerate observers that
“ there is no such enemy to peace as jealousy en-
“ couraged, and that indulged suspicion is an endless
“ fund of contention.”*

Though the controversy arose amongst, and was confined to, the dissenters; yet an appeal was made to the judgment of two celebrated divines in the established church, Dr. Stillingfleet bishop of Worcester, and Dr. Jonathan Edwards, lately the principal of Jesus college, Oxford.

One point of debate which was started in the disputes of the day, related to a commutation of persons between Christ and believers. This, it was alleged, Dr. Stillingfleet had asserted and supported in his answer to Grotius on the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction; and this Dr. Williams was charged with denying, because he had denied what Dr. Crisp called a change of person, (not persons in the plural) *i. e.* a change of condition and state between Christ and a sinner; Christ thereby becoming as sinful as we, and we as righteous as he. Dr. Williams was

|| Calamy, vol. i. p. 515, 516; Calamy's Life of Howe, p. 183; Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, p. 260—263.

* Life of Howe, p. 184.

induced, on this representation of his sentiments, to address a letter to the bishop, requesting his judgment on three questions: 1. What was his sense of commutation of persons? 2. Whether the author of "Gospel Truth" was chargeable with Socinianism? and 3. Whether Dr. Crisp's sense concerning the change of person or persons were true or false? He supported his request by urging that his lordship's sentiments were pleaded against him. Mr. Lob, one of the independent party, though no direct antinomian, endeavoured also to secure the bishop as an umpire in their disputes; by a letter, informing him of the controversy then subsisting among the dissenters, in which a reference had been made to his lordship's sentiments; and soliciting him, that he would condescend to give them his impartial thoughts on the point, "as being likely on both hands, to be so received as to compose the differences between them." Before this letter came to hand, the bishop had already answered Dr. Williams, and given his sentiments on the points mentioned in both their letters with great freedom and impartiality, as well as with singular candour and judgment. This letter was, on the receipt of Mr. Lob's, published in vindication of Dr. Williams against the heavy charges alleged against him. Mr. Lob on this addressed a second letter to the bishop, expressing much satisfaction with what he had written, and offering his thanks for it. He apprised his lordship, that to afford him a fuller state of the matters in controversy, and to furnish him with more ample means of composing

their differences, he was preparing for the press an "Appeal" directed to his lordship; to whom he offered to send the sheets for his inspection in manuscript. This proposal the bishop waved. The Appeal, as soon as it was printed, was sent to his lordship; who, as a perfect master of the cause, considered it with great exactness, but did not live to finish his answer to it. What appeared gave the public a true state of the controversy, and fully vindicated both Mr. Baxter and Dr. Williams from the charge of going over to the camp of the focinians.* A paragraph on this point deserves to be quoted, as an evidence of the bishop's candour, and as an admonition to those who are ready in the present day to bring forward invidious charges.

"There is," said the bishop, "a remarkable story in the history of the Synod of Dort, which may not be improper in this place. There were in one of the universities of that country two professors, both very warm and extremely zealous for that which they accounted the most *orthodox* doctrine; but it happened that one of these accused the other before the synod for no fewer than *fifty* errors, tending to focinianism, pelagianism, &c. &c.; and wonderful heat there was on both sides. At last a committee was appointed to examine this dreadful charge; and upon examination they found no ground for the charge of focinianism, or any other heresy; but only that he had asserted too much the use of ambiguous and

* Bishop Bull's Life, p. 264—269.

“ scholastic terms, and endeavoured to bring in the
“ way of the schoolmen, in his writings ; and there-
“ fore the synod dismissed him with that prudent ad-
“ vice,—Rather to keep to the language of the
“ scriptures than of the schools.”*

Dr. Edwards, to whom were sent the same questions, which had been laid before Bishop Stillingfleet, addressed in answer a letter to Dr. Williams, in which he also fully acquitted him of giving any countenance to the opinions of Socinus; and justified him against his accusers, as having stated in a right and an orthodox manner the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction.

But the progress of the controversy has been anticipated by introducing here the appeal made to those two eminent divines of the Established Church. For, previously to this stage of it, a design was formed to exclude Dr. Williams out of the lecture at Pinner's Hall, in 1694. A new lecture was set up at Salter's Hall: three of the old lecturers, Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, and Mr. Alsop, accompanied him to the new lecture; and two others were added: and four were joined to the old lecturers, Mr. Mead and Mr. Cole, who remained at Pinner's Hall. The supporters of the new lectures consisted of the greatest part of the old subscribers, men of great piety and judgment, who perceiving the violence of the other party, when all pacific proposals and measures had proved abortive, removed to a more convenient place.† Thus the lecture was broken

* Calamy's Life of Howe, p. 184, 5. † Ibid. p. 194.

into two; Mr. Howe's friendly proposal, urged by him, both publicly and privately, to alternate the same lecture in both places, could not be carried; and the separation continued. A few years since the lecture at Salters' Hall, for want of support and attendance, was given up.

Besides Mr. Howe's conciliating proposal, another attempt for reunion was made, by an offer on one side to renounce Arminianism, and on the other Antinomianism; but this plan of harmony proved unsuccessful. Soon after, a few particular ministers of each party privately drew up a paper, with a hope that they should be able by their influence to prevail on both sides to sign it. But this measure, instead of extinguishing old differences, created new ones. Some were zealous for it, and complained much that it was not adopted. Others warmly opposed it, and, among various reasons, because they conceived of it as bearing hard upon Dr. Williams.†

It affords an unhappy instance of the asperity and malignity of party, that not only the sentiments of Dr. Williams were censured and stigmatized, but an attack was made on his reputation, an attack so peculiar as scarcely to admit of any precedent; which, observes Dr. Calamy, "was far from recommending the dissenters, as to their candour or conduct, to standers by." But the ends of his adversaries were not answered. For after about eight weeks spent in an inquiry into his life by a committee of the united ministers, who received all manner of

† Calamy, p. 549.

complaints against him, it was declared at a general meeting, as their *unanimous opinion*, and repeated and agreed to in three several successive meetings, that “he was entirely clear and innocent of all that “was laid to his charge.”*

It was subsequent to this, that a new clamour was raised against him : on which the appeal was made to Bishop Stillingfleet and Dr. Edwards, which has been already mentioned. Though that prelate vindicated the sentiments of Dr. Williams, he censured, in a charge to his clergy in 1696, the body of dissenters, as defective in their discipline, on account of their divisions : a censure, which seems to indicate that his lordship was inclined to apply coercive measures in such a case, instead of employing argument and persuasion to convince them of their errors, and leaving it to time and reflection to calm and compose their minds. In consequence of the appeal made to the learned members of the church, various publications on both sides issued from the press : but whether prejudices were softened, or passion had spent itself, or argument at length produced conviction, the dissenters became cool, and the controversy was terminated, at the instance of Mr. Lob, by Dr. Williams in 1698, who printed a few sheets entitled, “an End to Discord :” in which he stated the orthodox as also the Socinian and antinomian notions as to Christ’s satisfaction ; and interpreted the confession of those more sober independents in as orthodox as a sense as their words with the most

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 549. Bishop Bull’s Life, p. 276.

charitable construction could bear. It is almost incredible how much Dr. Williams was a sufferer in this controversy, from some who were too apt to act their principles against such as opposed them : for he had to contend with a strong party, who would leave nothing unattempted to crush him if possible. “ But he had counted the cost;” as he wrote to a very respectable member of the Established Church, “ even though his life had been “ sacrificed.” This integrity, zeal, and fortitude in opposing, under such circumstances, what appeared to him pernicious errors, displayed the energy of principle, and excellence of his own character. To his indefatigable and zealous exertions it is in a great degree, ascribed, that within sixteen years after the close of this controversy, the number of antimonians among the dissenters was so reduced, that only three or four preachers of that denomination, and those men of no estimation, were left : the opposite principles could be advanced without exciting a clamour, and most of the independents and baptists in the metropolis preached against antimonianism.*

Another effect of this controversy was, that from the time of forming a new and separate lecture at Saters’ Hall, the two denominations of presbyterians and independents became distinct communities, and acted separately with respect to their own denominations. And the ground of this separation being in doctrinal sentiments, the terms came afterwards to signify not a difference in Church Government,

* Nelson’s Life of Bishop Bull, p. 274—276.

according to their original meaning, but in doctrinal opinions: the latter being applied to denote the reception of calvinistic, the former to signify the belief of arminian sentiments; or respectively of creeds similar to either system.

CHAPTER III.

Internal History of the Protestant Dissenters.

SECTION I.

Of their Academies.

THE Act of Uniformity ejected from the church men of the first learning in the age ; men, who were the ornaments both of sacred and general literature. The names of Baxter, Owen, Howe, and Bates ; of Clarkson, who was tutor of Tillotson ; of Gale, who wrote “ the Court of the Gentiles ;” of Hill, the editor of “ Schrevelius’ Lexicon ;” of Poole, the author of the “ Synopsis Criticorum ;” of Cradock, who with solid judgment and depth of thought methodized and illustrated the sacred historians ; of Clark, the annotator ; of Tombes, preacher at the Temple ; of Ray, the naturalist ; of Gilpin, an accomplished scholar and eminent physician ; and of Vinckes, an universal scholar ; are enrolled in the honourable list of those, who, having been themselves enriched with stores of learning, largely contributed to extend the limits of science and theological literature by their researches and writings. These names, however, bear but a small proportion to the many who, among the Bar-

tholomew divines, were held in high estimation for their learning.

The edict that deprived them of their livings could not despoil them of their erudition. The literary taste which they had formed in the seats of the Muses, and the treasures of knowledge which they had laid up, qualified them, in an eminent degree, when driven from their pulpits, to undertake the instruction of youth. The straitened circumstances of many obliged them, when they had lost the revenues of their vicarages and rectories, to seek some compensation by applying their talents and learning to the offices of education. Some became tutors in private families ; some opened schools ; and some established academies, in which they read lectures on different branches of science and theology.

The statute which was designed to secure the national establishment, by crushing the dissidents, had an opposite effect. It led numbers to separate themselves from the church, who were considerable in point of influence derived from rank or estates or commercial pursuits. This secession originated partly from principle, founded in objections to the establishment ; partly from attachment to revered and worthy ministers, whom that statute had ejected ; and partly from sympathy in the unmerited sufferings which those ministers were hence called upon to bear. The subsequent proceedings of government were not suited to conciliate the separatists, and to recover them to the communion of the church ; but tended by new edicts and prosecutions to irritate to

a greater degree minds already exasperated. These dissidents had families to be educated, and naturally looked to those whose talents and learning they respected, and of whose sufferings they were partakers, as the most proper tutors for their sons; especially for those of them who were destined to the ministry, or to the walks of law or physic. This became more particularly the case, as the secession created objections not before felt against ministerial conformity; and when the new congregations formed under the ejected ministers were, by the deaths of their first pastors successively, in want of a new race of ministers to fill up the vacant places. All these causes operated against the short-sighted views of the legislature, and defeated in a great measure the schemes of intolerance. Encouragement was afforded to those who were disposed to adopt plans of education; and seminaries, which but for a malignant policy would never have existed, were opened in various parts of the kingdom to meet the wishes of such as would otherwise have sent their sons to the Universities.

The consequences, when it was too late to prevent them, were seen and felt. These rising seminaries were viewed with fear and jealousy; yet recourse was not had to remedial measures of a mild and liberal nature. Several aspersions were cast on those who taught University learning; the calm retreat of the student was haunted by the spectre of intolerance; and harassing processes in the spiritual court were commenced against those who presided over

theological seminaries. Mr. Morton, of Newington Green, was forced by such measures to desist from his literary employment, after a continuance in it with reputation for twenty years. A particular ground of censure and of proceedings against those who were thus occupied, in different dioceses, was the oath by which they had bound themselves on taking a degree in the Universities; which was considered as precluding them, by this solemn engagement, from keeping private academies; and even any bishop, consistently with his oath, from granting a licence for it. The candid Tillotson judged this to be a proper principle on which a diocesan might restrain any one who had received a diploma in either university from keeping an academy; and recommended it to Archbishop Sharp, when the clergy of Craven petitioned him to suppress Mr. Frankland's seminary, to act upon this ground, without considering him at all as a dissenter, "as the fairest and softest way of getting rid of the business."†

The oath alluded to, as administered at Oxford, ran in these words, "Jurabis etiam, quod in ista facultate alibi in Anglia quam hic et Cantabrigiæ, lectiones tuas solenniter, tanquam in universitate non resumes; nec in aliquâ facultate, sicut in universitate, solenniter incipies; nec consenties ut aliquis alibi in Anglia incipiens hic pro magistro habeatur. Item jurabis, quod non leges aut audies Stamfordiæ tanquam in universitate, studio vel collegio generali."

† Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 296.

The form at Cambridge is this, “Jurabis quod
“nusquam præterquam Oxoniæ lectiones tuas so-
“lenniter resumes, nec consenties ut aliquis alibi in
“Anglia incipiens hic pro magistro vel doctore in
“illa facultate habeatur.”*

At the presentation for degrees these oaths were administered. The original occasion of these oaths was this. In the early ages of literature those branches of science which are taught at universities, were studied and professed in the several monasteries throughout the kingdom. Afterwards the celebrity and reputation of the superiors of the monasteries at Oxford and Cambridge drew a voluntary concourse of students to those towns; and some noble personages, patrons of literature, encouraged by these propitious circumstances, and with a view of alluring foreigners to these places, which were by rapid improvement become the seats of the Muses, erected certain *hospitia* or buildings for the reception of students, and liberally endowed them. The

* The Oxford oath in English. “Thou shalt swear that thou
“wilt not in this faculty resume thy solemn lections as in an Uni-
“versity in any place in England, except here or at Cambridge:
“That thou wilt not solemnly commence in any faculty as in an
“university: And that thou wilt not consent that any one com-
“mencing elsewhere in England shall be regarded as a master.
“Thou shalt also swear thou wilt not read nor hear at Stamford as
“in an University, or general college and *place* of study.”

The oath at Cambridge in English. “Thou shalt swear that thou
“wilt never resume thy common lections but at Oxford: And that
“thou wilt not consent that any one commencing at any other
“place in England shall be regarded here as a master or doctor in
“that faculty.”

convenience of Oxford and Cambridge in point of Situation also recommended them as places of resort. Peculiar privileges were granted to such as entered themselves as students in them, by the bulls of popes and the charters of princes. Degrees, or public testimonials of genius and proficiency, were invented as incitements to emulation and diligence in study. But while ingenuous youth were invited by such allurements to these schools of philosophy, and great numbers resorted to them, yet no injunction or law prevented persons from receiving or reading lectures at any other place. When the numbers of students at Oxford and Cambridge, in consequence of the peculiar encouragements they afforded, continually increased, and no code of statutes was formed and enacted to keep order amongst them, frequent tumults and riots broke out among the pupils themselves, and between them and the townsmen. On some particular factions of this kind many students deserted these seminaries, and removed, some to Northampton and other places, but a greater part to Stamford. Being settled here, they began with the patronage of some great persons to lay the foundations of an university, built colleges, performed academical exercises, and instituted degrees. An alarm was taken, on the desertion of their own schools and the growing reputation of that at Stamford, by Oxford and Cambridge. Interest was made with prelates and princes to recal the students who had left them: after some difficulty and opposition they carried their measure; the seminary at Stamford was suppressed;

new colleges were founded at Oxford and Cambridge, greater immunities were granted, and laws were framed to introduce and establish good order and discipline. By degrees the students returned, and Stamford was forsaken; but still it seems, by the specific mention of it in the Oxford oath, to have been particularly viewed with the eye of jealousy; and it was favoured by characters of great influence. To bar a future secession, the oath, which we have quoted, was drawn up and imposed; that even princes themselves, if they were disposed to establish other universities, might be greatly impeded, if not wholly obstructed in their design, and not be able to remove professors from Cambridge or Oxford to preside over seminaries in other places, unless the pope was pleased to dispense with their oaths. The papal policy afterwards availed itself of institutions, at first formed purely for the advancement of learning, to serve its interest and aggrandize its power, when it was seen that those places had a great influence on the disposition of the nation. The popes secured these two places as fountains of power; limited their patronage and sanction to these seats only, as two could easily be managed and controlled; the prelates of the church became great founders, and framed their statutes to subserve their political and ambitious views; and popery continuing the established religion through many centuries, these two universities, by a kind of custom, became the only national seminaries.*

* Calamy's Continuation, vol. i. p. 181, 182.

They who were unfriendly to the dissenters construed the oaths under consideration to mean, “that
“no man, who had taken the degree of Master in
“Arts in either of our universities, might lawfully
“instruct so much as privately in any other place,
“any persons in any art or science professed publicly
“in the universities.” This construction of the oath served two purposes: one was to set up an exclusive claim to the privilege, honour, and emoluments of communicating university learning; to establish it as a principle, “no licence, no philosophy, out of our seminaries:” the other was to brand as perjured persons those dissenters, who on admittance to degrees had taken these oaths, and who privately instructed in learning, which bears the appropriate name of *academical*: and to set up a ground on which they might be harassed by expensive and litigious processes.

Other interpretations of the oath, more mild and liberal in themselves, and on which the heads of seminaries among the nonconformists rested their defence, were these: either “that the literal meaning
“is to obstruct only public, not private reading or
“teaching philosophy in other places; and that as
“to this public reading the oath is now antiquated,
“void, and null:” of this opinion was Bishop Taylor. The other reasonable interpretation of the oath is, “it means not teaching at all, either public
“or private, but only performing exercises of probation; and that by *lectiones tuas solenniter*
“*tanquam in universitate*, are meant only some of

“ the exercises for a degree, which were designed as
“ specimens of talents and proficiency ; and the
“ solemnity enjoined referred to matter, or to the
“ orders of the university, concerning habit and time.
“ The word *resumes* is explained to mean taking the
“ same degree again, or doing the same exercise, for
“ the same purpose elsewhere ; as if the university
“ degree were not a sufficient honour, unless ratified
“ elsewhere. *Incipies* is the known term, among
“ academics, to denote taking a degree of master or
“ doctor. This construction of the oath was argued
“ to be just, by the state of things from which it
“ originated : and from the clause relative to Stam-
“ ford evincing that owning a place for an university,
“ by performing university exercises in it, was the
“ practice against which it was meant to guard.
“ Another clause, repeated three times, first used
“ with reference to lectures, then to degrees, and
“ lastly to Stamford, *tanquam in universitate*, as it
“ is done in the university, pointing to the forma-
“ lities of the universities, it was urged, fixed the
“ words to this meaning.” To justify this interpre-
tation of the oath, an appeal was made to the
prelatical men, then filling sees and other high
posts, who in recent times had privately read lectures
on university learning, in private places, to the sons
of the nobility and gentry. It was pleaded, that
it had been a common practice to read lectures
publicly, as well as privately, as in Gresham and
Sion Colleges : and it was argued that the press
was a more public mode of teaching than vocal.

reading; yet the guilt of perjury or of offending against the university oath had never been imputed to those who published books of philosophy. An argument against construing the oath as an obligation to refrain from giving any instruction, either public or private, out of the university, was also drawn from the consequences which would be involved in it; consequences criminal and prejudicial. It would oblige some men to hide their talents; and others not to provide for their own houses by the application of that learning, in the acquisition of which they had probably spent their portions. It would oblige many to educate their children in a way contrary to their own consciences, or in their apprehensions, considering the temptations at the universities, under circumstances hazardous to the morals of youth; or otherwise to withhold from their sons all opportunities of making attainments in literature. And it would imply an obligation to take up their morals and religion on the authority of the university; an implicitness incongruous with the privileges, and repugnant to the principles of protestants.*

On these principles, those of the ejected ministers, who opened academies, though they had graduated at one of the universities and taken this oath, vindicated themselves from the reflections cast upon their conduct, and endeavoured to expose the iniquity and illegality of the processes commenced against them.

* See these arguments more fully stated in Calamy's Continuation, vol. i. p. 177—197; vol. ii. p. 732—735.

Among those who engaged in the education of youth, and presided over seminaries with reputation and success, were Mr. Woodhouse, Mr. Warren, Mr. Morton, Mr. Frankland, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Shuttlewood, Mr. Veal.

No. 1. *Mr. Woodhouse's Academy.*

Mr. Woodhouse, though not ejected, not being fixed at that time in any place as a minister, was silenced by the Act of Uniformity, while he resided in Nottinghamshire. He afterwards married a lady of good fortune, the daughter of Major Hubbard of Leicestershire; yet he did not consider himself as excused from active and useful exertions, but opened a seminary in the manor-house at Sheriffhales, near Shiffnal in Shropshire, which flourished in King Charles II'd's reign, and obtained celebrity. The mixture of sweetness with authority in the government of his academy gave him a beneficial influence over his pupils, whose studies he directed with singular ability, diligence, and fidelity; youth from the most considerable families in those parts were placed under his care. At one time his students amounted to between forty and fifty. Many, who afterwards made an eminent figure in the world as gentlemen and magistrates, as well as excellent divines, were educated by him. He piously managed his house as a nursery for heaven, as well as a school for learning; and on those who were intended for the pulpit, he frequently inculcated a faithful, diligent aim to promote the salvation of souls, as a matter of the highest account. A list of some, who received

from him the principles of learning and religion, especially of those who were assistants and immediate successors to the ejected ministers, and who sustained the character themselves with exemplary assiduity in its duties, does honour to his memory.* When circumstances led him to break up his seminary, his mind, which revolted at the thought of an useless life, was greatly dejected; and it was his frequent lamentation, "Now every field is unpleasant, for I fear I shall live to no purpose." But Providence soon opened to him a new sphere of service, for he was invited to be pastor of a congregation at Little St. Helen's, Bishopsgate-street, London; where he discharged the duties of his ministry, with affection, zeal, and usefulness, till within a few days of his death, which took place in 1700. Dr. J. C. Woodhouse, the present dean of Lichfield, the author of a translation and exposition of the book of the Revelation, a valuable work, written in the spirit of true criticism, is his great grandson. The late excellent christian, and candid biblical critic, Mr. John Simpson, of Bath, was descended from this worthy man, and by marriage became more closely connected with the family of Woodhouse.

The students in the seminary at Sheriffhales were conducted through a course of lectures on logic, anatomy, and mathematics; beginning usually with the first, and sometimes with one or the other of these branches of knowledge. These

* See Appendix, No. v.; see Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial vol. ii. p. 297, 8; and Thompson's Account of Dissenting Academies, MS. p. 1, 2.

were followed by lectures in physics, ethics, and rhetoric. They were heard successively in Greek and Hebrew, at other times of the day or week. A law lecture was read one day in the week to those who had entered at the Inns of Court, or were designed for the law: and they who were intended for the pulpit were conducted through a course of theological reading. All the students were obliged to read, in natural theology, Grotius de Veritate Christianæ Religionis, construing it and giving the sense of it as one of their Latin authors: to this succeeded the reading of Wilkins's "Principles of Natural Religion," Fleming's "Confirming Work," Baxter's "Reasons of the Christian Religion," Bates "on the Existence of God, Immortality of the Soul, and Divinity of the Christian Religion," and Stillingfleet's "Origines Sacræ," with parts of Bochart. In logic they began with Burgedicius; which was gone through a second time with Heereboord's Commentary: Sanderson, Wallis, Ramus, and his commentator Downam, were recommended to their private perusal. The mathematical authors, through which they were conducted, were principally Galtruchius, Leybourn, Moxon, Gunter, Gassendi, and Euclid's Elements, which were read late. In geography, Eachard, and in history, Puffendorf, furnished the text books. In natural philosophy, the authors read and explained were Heerebord, Magirus, De Carte's "Principia," Rhegius, Rohault, and De Stair, for both old and new physics. In anatomy, with Gibson was joined

the perusal of Blancardi *Anatomia Reformata*, and Bartholine. The writers adopted to guide them in their ethical studies were Eustachius, Whitby, More, and Heereboord's "*Colleg. Ethic.*" And in metaphysics, Froamenius, Facchæus, and Baronius; to whom were added, Blank's "*Theses*," and Davenant or Ward's "*Determinationes*." In Rhetoric, they were assisted by Radau, Quintilian, and Vossius. In law, they read "*Doctor and Student*," Littleton's "*Tenures*," or Coke on Littleton. In theology, the authors read and explained were the Westminster Assembly's "*Confession of Faith*," and "*Larger Catechism*," Corbet's "*Humble Endeavour*," Ruffonius's "*Compendium of Turretin*." These were followed by Calvin's "*Institutes*," Pareus on Ursin, Baxter's "*End of Controversy*," and Methodus "*Theologiæ*," Williams's "*Gospel Truth*," Le Blane's "*Theses*," and Dixon's "*Therapeutica Sacra*."

In all lectures, the authors were strictly explained, and commonly committed to memory, at least as to the sense of them. On one day, an account of the lecture of the preceding day was required before a new lecture was read; and on Saturday a review of the lectures of the five days before was delivered. When an author had been about half gone through, they went that part over again; and so the second part passed under a second perusal: so that every one author was read three times. And after this they exercised one another by questions and problems on the most difficult points that occurred.

Practical exercises accompanied the course of lectures; and the students were employed at times in surveying land, composing almanacks, making sundials of different constructions, and dissecting animals. On one day of the week Latin, Greek, and Hebrew nouns and verbs were publicly declined in the lecture room: disputations, after a logical form, were holden on Friday afternoon: they were accustomed to English composition under the form of letters and speeches: and the students designed for the ministry, according to their seniority, were practised in analysing some verses of a psalm or chapter, drawing up skeletons or heads of sermons, and short schemes of prayer and devotional specimens according to Bishop Wilkins's method; and were called on to pray in the family on the evening of the Lord's day, and to set psalms to two or three tunes. On the Saturday evening a didactical or polemical lecture in divinity, either on Wollebius's "*Compendium Theologiæ*," or on Ames's "*Medula Theologiæ*," was read by the tutor to the senior class; and the class was required to give the literal sense of the author. On the Lord's day morning, at the time of family prayer, another lecture on divinity took place, when the junior class gave an account of some portion of Vincent's "*Exposition of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism*," representing the sense of the author; on which the tutor enlarged, as the occasion dictated and the subject required. Once a year there was a repetition of all the grammars, especially of the

Oxford Latin Grammar, by all the students. The Hebrew was taught by Bythner's "Grammar" and "Lyra," as well adapted to each other.*

No. 2. *Mr. Warren's Academy.*

Mr. Matthew Warren, of Oxford University, the younger son of Mr. John Warren, a gentleman of good fortune at Otterford in Devon, being ejected from the chapelry of Downhead in Somersetshire, soon engaged, at the importunity of some friends, in the honourable literary employment of educating youth for the Christian ministry; and, after

* From MS. papers with which John Woodhouse Crompton, esq., of Birmingham, favoured the author. Among them is a certificate of the ordination of Mr. William Woodhouse, of Rearsby, in the county of Leicester, 21st of August 1702. This gentleman was the son of the tutor. It is a document which shews the practice of the day, and the idea then entertained of the nature and efficiency of the service. It runs thus: "Forasmuch as Mr. William Woodhouse, of Rearsby, in the county of Leicester, has desired to enter orderly, according to the rules of the gospel, into the sacred office of the ministry, and has requested us, whose names are under-written, solemnly to invest him with the ministerial authority, and knowing him to be sound and orthodox in his judgment, of a pious and unblameable life, and sufficient ministerial abilities, (no exception being made against his ordination and admission,) we have approved him, and proceeded solemnly to set him apart to the office of a presbyter, and all the parts and duties belonging to it, with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands, and do, so far as concerns us, empower him to perform all the offices and duties of a minister of Jesus Christ. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands this twenty-first day of August, anno Dom. 1702.

"JOHN DOUGHTY, Minister of the Gospel.

"MICHAEL MATTHEWS, Minister of the Gospel.

"SAMUEL LAWRENCE, Minister of the Gospel."

meeting with many difficulties and molestations in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. he was for many years at the head of a flourishing academy at Taunton in Somersetshire. He was generally acknowledged to be well qualified for his office as tutor, by a good share of useful learning; and by humility, modesty, and good humour, which were distinguishing traits in his character, peculiarly adapted to the various temper and genius of young persons, and to conciliate the affections of his pupils. Convinced of the great importance, and even necessity, for the conduct of future life, of furnishing the youthful minds with principles of morality, he directed his particular attention to the improvement of his pupils' understandings in that part of learning. In reading lectures he had the happy art of explaining things, even to the lowest capacities. He had been himself educated in the old logic and philosophy, and was little acquainted with the improvements of the new; yet it was expressive of liberality of mind and good sense, that he encouraged his pupils in freedom of enquiry, and in the study of those authors who were better suited to gratify the love of knowledge and truth, even though they differed from the writers on whom he had formed his own sentiments. While *Burgersdicius* or *Derodon*, and in ethics *Eustacius*, were used as text-books in the lecture-room; *Locke*, *Le Clerc*, and *Cumberland* were guides to just thinking, close reasoning, and enlightened views, in their closets. Mr. Warren was never confident or imposing; never vehement or rigid in his own opinion;

but open to argument, and disposed to prefer the judgment of others to his own. He was reckoned among the moderate divines of the day: ever studious of the things that make for peace, and promote christian harmony and love. He encouraged the free and critical study of the scriptures. Many young gentlemen, who afterwards filled civil stations with respectability and worth, and others who appeared in the ministry with credit and usefulness, were educated under him. The name of Mr. Grove, whose genius, character, and talents were formed in his seminary, is alone sufficient to do honour to its president. § Mr. Warren died in 1706.

No. 3. *Mr. Charles Morton's Academy.*

Mr. Charles Morton, ejected from the rectory of Blisland in Cornwall, of Wadham college, Oxford, was descended from an ancient family at Morton in Nottinghamshire, the seat of J. Morton, secretary to King Edward III. He was a general scholar, but was particularly eminent for his knowledge of the mathematics; on which account he was greatly valued by Dr. Wilkins, the warden of the college of which he was a fellow. After his ejection he removed to a small tenement, his own property, in the parish of St. Ives, where he resided till the fire of London, in which he sustained great loss. He was solicited by several friends to undertake the instruc-

§ Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. ii. p. 358; Grove's Works, preface, vol. i. p. 14; and Sprint's Funeral Sermon for Warren, p. 45, 46, 5c. Appendix, No. v.

tion of youth in academical learning, for which he had extraordinary qualifications. With this view he settled at Newington Green. He had a peculiar talent of winning youth to the love of virtue and learning by the pleasantness of his conversation, and by a familiar way of making difficult subjects easily intelligible. He drew up systems of the several arts and sciences for the use of his pupils, which he explained in his lectures, and which the students copied. One, entitled *Eutaxia*, exhibited the principles of policy exactly correspondent to the English Constitution; asserting at once the rights and honour of the crown, and the liberties of the subject. It traced the original of all government to the institution of God; enforced from the subject love to the person of the king, obedience to the laws, and a dutiful submission to legal taxes for the support of the crown and the laws. It confirmed the ordinary method of succession; and in case of total subversion or failure, gave a right to the *ordines regni* to restore the constitution, by the extraordinary call of some person to the throne. It is pronounced by one who had seen it to have been so compleat, ingenious, and judicious a system, as to be equal, if not superior, to any printed composition of the kind. He also drew up a Compendium of Logic, which was the text book in Harvard college, after he became president of that American seminary, till it was superseded by one on a more improved plan by Mr. Brattle, minister of the church in Cambridge. A copy of each, as rare specimens of American literature are preserved in the

cabinet of the historical society. A great many young ministers were educated by him, as well as other good scholars; and numbers of each class were afterwards very useful in church and state; and the seminary was marked by an universal sentiment of respect for the great and excellent men of the episcopal order, and an emulation of their virtues. Mr. Morton himself was a pious, learned, and ingenious man; of a sweet natural temper, and a generous public spirit; an indefatigable friend, beloved and valued by all that knew him. After having appeared in the character of a tutor with reputation for twenty years, he was so harassed with processes in the ecclesiastical court, that he found himself constrained to relinquish it; and being under great apprehensions for the interests of the nation, he emigrated to New England in 1685, and was chosen pastor of a church in Charlestown, over against Boston, and vice-president of Harvard college. Mr. Morton died April 1697, in the 80th year of his age. In the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society there is a treatise of his, entitled "A Discourse on improving the county of Cornwall;" the seventh chapter of which is on sea sand for manure. He published several small treatises, as he was an enemy to large volumes, and often said, *Μεγα βιβλιον μεγα κακον*, "a great book is a great evil." Dr. Calamy has preserved, besides his vindication of himself and brethren from the charge of perjury, on account of teaching university learning, "Advice to Candidates

“for the Ministry, under the present discouraging
“circumstances.” It was drawn up in the reign of
Charles II. but deserves the frequent perusal and
serious attention of those who bear that character in
the present day. Both these pieces afford proofs of
the talents and excellent spirit of the author. It is
to be regretted that only few names of his students
are come down to us.*

No. 4. *Mr. Richard Frankland's Academy.*

Mr. Richard Frankland, being ejected from a
lectureship at Bishop's-Aukland in the county of
Durham, was born in 1630, at Rathmill in the
parish of Giggleswick in Craven, a division of the
West Riding of Yorkshire; and received his classical
learning at a famous school there. In 1647 he was
entered a student in Christ college, Cambridge, of
which Dr. Sam. Bolton was master; where he made
a good proficiency in human and sacred literature,
and imbibed a deep sense of religion. There he took
the degree of master of arts; and on his removal
from college, after a short residence at Hexham on
an invitation thither, he successively preached at
Haughton-le-Spring, Lanchester, and Bishop's Auk-
land. The living of Aukland-St.-Andrew's, which
was a valuable one, was presented to him by Sir

* Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. i. p. 273, 4; Calamy's Account, p. 144; Continuation, vol. i. p. 176—211; Dr. Eliot's American Biographical Dictionary, article Morton; Sam. Palmer's Defence of the Education in Dissenting Academies, p. 10; and Vindication of the Dissenters, in answer to Mr. Wesley's Defence, &c. 4to. 1705, p. 52—54; Appendix No. v.

Arthur Haflerig. It is a testimony that he was well known, and that his learning and character were esteemed, that when the Protector Cromwell had erected a college for academical learning at Durham, in 1657, Mr. Frankland was fixed upon to be a tutor in it. By the destruction of the institution at the Restoration he lost the office; and the Act of Uniformity, with which he refused to comply, though solicited to it by Bishop Cosins with a promise of preferment, excluded him from his living; and he retired to his own estate at Rathmill. Here the persuasions of friends prevailed with him to open a private academy; and so much was he encouraged in this liberal employment of his talents, that in the space of twenty-nine years three hundred young gentlemen had received their education under him. In the mean time he repeatedly changed the place of his abode; but still carried on his academy wherever he went. In 1674 he removed to Natland, near Kendal, in Westmoreland, on an invitation to become the minister of a church there. By the harassing operation of the five-mile act, he was obliged to leave that place; and removed in succession to Dawsonfold in the same county, to Harthurrow in Lancashire, to Calton in Craven in Yorkshire, to Attercliffe near Sheffield, and again to Rathmill. He had the reputation of being an acute mathematician, an eminent divine, sagacious in the detection of error, and able in the defence of truth, and a solid interpreter of scripture; a zeal to promote the gospel in all places, united with great moderation, humility of mind, and affability of deportment, liberality to the

poor, and an amiable attention to all relative duties, formed in his character leading features. He was generally beloved, and very useful; yet his patience and fortitude were tried by many and various troubles: and even after the Revolution to his death in 1698, when he was 68 years of age, there was scarcely a year passed in which he did not meet with some disturbance. Dr. Latham has given us a list of his pupils.†

No. 5. *Mr. Doolittle's Academy.*

Mr. Doolittle, A. M. of Pembroke hall, Cambridge, was a native of Kidderminster; and ejected from the rectory of St. Alphage, London Wall. He first opened a boarding-school in Moorfields, which was much encouraged and patronised; he had twenty-eight pupils, when that malignant fever, called the plague, broke out; on this he removed to Woodford bridge on Epping forest. Upon a license granted by King Charles II. in 1672, he returned to the vicinity of the city, became the pastor of a large congregation in Monkwell-street;‡

† Calamy's Account, p. 284—288; Continuation, vol. i. p. 453; Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. i. p. 488—491; Appendix No. v.

‡ This was the first meeting-house built after the fire of London, 1662. In the vestry is preserved, framed and glazed, the royal license, which Mr. Doolittle took out on the declaration of indulgence granted to the nonconformists in 1672, signed by his Majesty's command, *Arlington*. It is thought to be the only memorial of the kind existing in the city.—See Wilson's Dissenting Churches, vol. iii. p. 186, 187; where the author has given an exact copy of it, for the satisfaction of the curious.

and set up a seminary on a more extensive plan at Islington, to educate young men for the ministry; in which he had the assistance of Mr. Thomas Vincent, M. A. of Christ-church, Oxford, ejected from St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-street, London; a gentleman well qualified for the office. When the Oxford Act passed, he removed to Wimbledon; and his lectures were privately attended by several of his pupils, who accommodated themselves with lodgings in the neighbourhood. Among the names of those who studied under him are some who afterwards made a figure, and soared above the lessons they had received in the academy. Mr. Doolittle, though a very worthy and diligent divine, was not very eminent for compass of knowledge or depth of thought.*

No. 6. *Mr. John Shuttlewood's Academy.*

Mr. John Shuttlewood, A. B. of Christ college, Cambridge, born at Wymeswold, Leicestershire, Jan. 3, 1631, was ejected from Raunston and Hoose, in the same county. He was a considerable sufferer for his nonconformity; for not only was he deprived of his living, but was harassed with various prosecutions, which obliged him to frequent removals; sometimes taking his abode in Leicestershire, and sometimes residing in Northamptonshire: yet he could not secure his person from imprisonment, nor evade the seizure of his goods. His health was much affected

* Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. i. p. 80—88; Matth. Henry's Life, p. 27; Emlyn's Works, vol. i.

and injured by his ministerial labours in incommodious places and at unseasonable hours, and by the evils of persecution in those rigorous and cruel times. His troubles, however, did not prevent his keeping a seminary at Sulby, near Welford, Northamptonshire, and at Little Creaton, where he lived, and died in the year of the Revolution. It appears from a memorandum in his pocket almanack, "that
"fix students were added to his seminary in one
"year." It seems to have had a good degree of reputation, and to have been sometimes flourishing. The list of students which time has transmitted down to us reflects credit on his academy, if not by the number of names, yet by eminence of character to which they rose. Mr. Shuttlewood was a man of ability and learning; an acceptable and useful preacher; much esteemed not only in the places of his residence, but through the neighbouring country. Of this the concise but impressive inscription on his tombstone was an honourable testimony; recording that he was "multum dilectus, multum deflendus," much beloved, much lamented.* He was the father of the dissenting cause in that part of Northamptonshire, in which he fixed his residence.

No. 7. *Mr. Samuel Cradock's Academy.*

Among others, who, when they were silenced by the Act of Uniformity, employed their talents and

* Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. ii. p. 123—128; and Thompson's MS. Collections, vol. ii. article Creaton.

learning for the instruction of youth, was Mr. Sam. Cradock, B. D. fellow of Emanuel college, Cambridge, ejected from the rectory of North Cadbury, Somersetshire. The sacrifice he made of this valuable living to the principle of conscience was compensated to him by the will of a gentleman, to whom he was next heir, Mr. Walter Cradock, of Wickham-Brook in Suffolk, who bequeathed his estate to him. He used to acknowledge with great thankfulness this allotment of Providence in his favour; and on the occasion took for his motto, "*Nec ingratus nec inutilis videar vixisse.*" He went some years after and resided in the mansion of his deceased friend; but not to indulge in useless inactivity. For some years he usually preached twice every Lord's day gratuitously to the neighbourhood; and commenced an instructor of youth in academical learning. In the number of those who studied under him were some who were afterwards distinguished by their stations in life and by worth of character. His lectures were grounded on systems of logic, natural and moral philosophy, and metaphysics; composed by himself, and extracted out of a variety of authors. His pupils were obliged to copy them out for their own use; they considered this a great drudgery, but Dr. Calamy, who was one of them, was inclined to think that the benefits attending this task overbalanced the inconveniencies and labour of it. Mr. Cradock treated his pupils in a gentleman like manner, lived upon his own estate, kept a good house, and was much respected by all the gentlemen

around the country. This was the natural consequence of a mind truly catholic, that regarded with esteem every man for his goodness,* and secured the esteem of all that were truly good ; a return for affable and courteous manners. His deportment was condescending, and his temper forgiving. “ We
 “ had,” says Dr. Calamy, “ our innocent diversions,
 “ and used to ride and visit any acquaintance we
 “ had at Bury, Sudbury, Newmarket, Cambridge,
 “ and other places in the neighbourhood ; but I
 “ never knew any thing like debauchery among Mr.
 “ Cradock’s domestics.” His publications remain as proofs of his solid judgment, digested thought, clear method, and unaffected style, as a writer ; while they breathe the spirit of serious and manly piety. His commentaries are still esteemed as valuable ; and his treatise, entitled, “ Knowledge and Practice,” has been recommended as the best book of its kind to young ministers.*

Among others who, after they were expelled from the pulpit, assisted the studies of young men, was Mr. Edward Veal, of Christ-church, Oxford, and afterwards of Trinity college, Dublin ; who at first exercised his ministry in Dublin and its vicinity ; and when he was deprived of his fellowship for nonconformity, became chaplain to Sir William Waller, in Middlesex ; and on the death of his patron, continued as a minister with a congregation in Wapping, and remained in this connection to a good old age. The

* Palmer’s *Nonconformist’s Memorial*, vol. i. p. 100. Dr. Calamy’s *History of his own Life and Times*, MS. ; and Philip Preaching Lectures, p. 82, 1702. &c.

infirmities of declining life obliged him to relinquish his pulpit and academy some years before his death, June 6, 1708, æt. 76. Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, an eminent and popular preacher, a pastor of the congregation at Salter's hall, called by Dr. Doddridge, on account of his vast wit and strength of expression, the dissenting *South*, who died suddenly in April 1702, is the only one of those who studied under Mr. Veal, whose name has been delivered down to us.

Others deserve to be mentioned with respect, as assisting the studies of youth, especially of those who were designed for the ministry; though the records of the times supply but very few particulars relative to their mode of instruction, and those who enjoyed the benefit of it. Among these was

The excellent Mr. *Philip Henry*; who, after he was ejected from Worthenbury, and removed to Broad Oak, till his death in 1696, frequently received into his house young gentlemen, who had in other seminaries finished a course of university learning, and were desirous of the benefit of his instructions and counsels; and who assisted in the education of his own children. One of the first who joined his family, in 1668, was Mr. Wm. Turner, of Edmund's Hall in Oxford, and afterwards for many years vicar of Walburton in Suffex; a serious, laborious, and useful preacher; author of an elaborate "History of all Religions in 1695," and of "A History of remarkable Providences, &c." the plan of which was suggested by Mr. Matthew Pool. Another, who had been a commoner in Edmund's Hall, and then pursued

his studies under Mr. Henry's roof, was his kinsman Mr. Robert Bozier, a young man of pregnant parts, great application, and exemplary piety; who died of a fever, in the 23d year of his age, Sept. 13, 1680, at Mr. Doolittle's, Islington, into whose seminary he had entered himself a few weeks before with Mr. Matthew Henry. Mr. Samuel Lawrence, of Nantwich, who spent some time in Mr. Morton's academy, at Newington Green; Mr. John Wilson, of Warwick, pupil also of Mr. Thomas Rowe; and Dr. Benion, of Shrewsbury, who studied likewise at Glasgow, placed themselves under the direction of Mr. Henry. The great thing which he used to press upon those who were candidates for the ministry, was to study the scriptures, and make them familiar. *Bonus textuarius est bonus theologus* was his favourite maxim. He would say to them, "you come to me as Naaman did to Elisha, expecting that I should do this or that for you; and, alas, I can but say as he did, *Go, wash in Jordan*: Go, study the scriptures. I profess to teach no other learning but scripture learning." With this view it was his custom to recommend to them the study of the Hebrew, and the use of an interleaved bible, into which to transcribe the expositions and observations which might occur in reading, and which often surpass those that are to be met with in professed commentators.†

Dr. *Theophilus Gale*, the learned author of "The Court of the Gentiles," (who died in 1678, and

† Theological and Biblical Magazine, vol. vii. p. 347; Philip Henry's Life, p. 128, 1699.

expressed his liberal zeal for the encouragement of learning by leaving all his real and personal estate for the education of poor scholars, and by the bequest of the philosophical part of his well-chosen library to students at home, and all the rest of it to Harvard college, New England,) opened an academy about the year 1666, at Newington Green; for the direction of which he was eminently qualified by his deep and universal learning. Mr. John Ashwood, a pious and excellent man, whose life was written by Mr. Thomas Reynolds; and Mr. Thomas Rowe, and Mr. Benoni Rowe, to whose names celebrity is attached, studied under him.

Dr. *Henry Langley*, a judicious and solid divine, fellow of Pembroke college, Oxford, afterwards appointed master by ordinance of Parliament in 1647, and in the next year made canon of Christ-church; when at the Restoration he was deprived of both these preferments by the visitors, retired to Tubney, near Abingdon, and instructed young men in academical learning. He died Sept. 10, 1679. Mr. James Waters, of Uxbridge, whose daughter married Mr. Mason, the author of the treatise on "Self Knowledge," commenced his studies under Dr. Langley.*

Mr. *John Malden*, ejected from Newport in Shropshire, a man of great learning, an excellent Hebrewian, and a solid preacher, as well as exemplary for piety and deep humility, afterwards kept a private academy near Whitchurch, in the same county, and

* Theological and Biblical Magazine, ut ante, p. 349.

had under his care many young men of great promise; among others Mr. Samuel Lawrence, after he left Mr. Henry, at the time of his death on May 23, 1681, æt. 60.*

Dr. *Obadiah Grew*, ejected from St. Michael's, Coventry, after the grant of public liberty, added to his ministerial labours the tuition of some young men for the ministry; an employment for which he was as eminently qualified by solid learning, sedateness of temper, and courteous manners, as by regular piety and great candour. His death terminated his useful exertions, Oct. 22, 1689. Mr. Samuel Pomfret, a pious and popular preacher in London, who formed a church of his own gathering about the end of the 17th century, and which consisted of more than 800 communicants, some years before his death, on 11th Jan. 1721—22, commenced his academical studies under Dr. Grew.

Mr. *Thos. Shewell*, M. A. a native of Coventry, educated in the University of Cambridge, and ejected by the Act of Uniformity from the vicarage of Lenham in Kent; succeeded Dr. Grew in his two characters of pastor and tutor, and conducted his academy till his death, Jan. 19, 1693.†

Dr. *Joshua Oldfield*, who had been a student in Christ's college, Cambridge, on settling at Coventry as successor to Mr. Shewill, followed the steps of his predecessors in teaching academical learning, and pursued this literary employment here for a con-

* Theological and Biblical Magazine, ut ante, p. 311.

† Idem, p. 312.

considerable time with great reputation, till his removal to London in 1700; where he resumed it, in conjunction with other learned divines; though during his residence at Coventry he met with much opposition from the spiritual courts. He was assisted in his labours as a tutor by his co-pastor Mr. Tong. §

Mr. *Henry Newcome*, of Manchester, who had been forced to remove to Ellenbrook by the Oxford Act, when he had liberty to license a place of worship in 1672, united with the character of the pastor that of the teacher of academical literature; for which he was well qualified, by his great proficiency in philosophy and theology, and by his ease and freedom in communicating from his stores of acquired knowledge. After his death in 1695, Mr. John Chorlton, a native of Salford, near Manchester, a student under Mr. Frankland, and first assistant and then successor to Mr. Newcome in his pastoral office, also engaged in the liberal employment of educating candidates for the ministry.*

Mr. *James Coningham*, M. A. educated in the University of Edinburgh, taught academical learning first at Penrith in Cumberland, where he began his ministry; and on removing to Manchester in 1700, to be co-pastor with Mr. Chorlton, united with him in his literary labours of tuition. He had to contend with persons inimical to the dissenters, after Mr. Chorlton's death in 1705, and was prosecuted by government for keeping an academy. This

§ Theo. and Bib. Magazine, p. 312, 313. * Id. p. 348, 349.

seminary appears to have been broken up on Mr. Coningham's removal to London to succeed Mr. Stretton, in 1712.*

Mr. Ralph Button, B. D. canon of Christ-church, Oxford, and orator of the University, who lost both his preferments at the Restoration, though he had celebrated that event in a Hebrew and Latin poem; should be mentioned as one of those who devoted their time and talents, when laid aside from their labours as ministers, to the laudable employment of training up youth in science and literature. After he was expelled from his posts in the university, he removed with his family to Brentford, where he was induced by the persuasion of two gentlemen, who were knights, privately to instruct their sons; for which he was cast into gaol, and suffered an imprisonment of six months. On the indulgence, he removed to Islington, and opened a private academy. Mr. Baxter adds to an encomium on his moral and religious character, that he was an excellent scholar. In the earlier part of his life he had been an eminent tutor in Exeter college; to a vacant fellowship in which he had been previously chosen by the recommendation of Dr. Prideaux, its rector, in 1633. In 1642 he removed to London, on the breaking out of the civil wars, and had been elected professor of geometry in Gresham college. These situations had prepared him for private tuition, and were proofs of his literary qualifications. He died in 1680. Among his pupils were Mr. Samuel

* Theological and Biblical Magazine, ut ante, p. 348, 349.

Pomfret, who finished his studies under him; Mr. King, of Wellingborough; and Sir Joseph Jekyll, the son of a clergyman; afterwards, as Mr. Whiston delineates his character with force and conciseness, “the most excellent and upright Master of the Rolls.” He was distinguished by his disinterested and steady attachment to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and by the patronage he afforded to sacred literature and its friends. Instances of this were a pension of 50*l.* per annum to Mr. Whiston, and an annual salary to Mr. Chubb, whom, before he fell into a sceptical state of mind, Mr. Whiston had introduced to him. To Sir Joseph Jekyll were dedicated, by their respective authors, Bishop Butler’s Sermons preached in the Rolls chapel, and Mr. Lowman’s Paraphrase and Notes on the Revelation.

Mr. *William Wickens*, stated by Calamy to have been ejected from St. Andrew Hubbard, Little Eastcheap, London, though at the Restoration it should seem he was not in possession of that living, but preacher at the Poultry Compter, is in the list of those who presided over private academies at Newington Green; where he preached to a small congregation till within two years of his death, Sept. 22, 1699, æt. 85. It may be concluded, that he was eminently qualified to assist theological studies, from his familiar acquaintance with the Old and New Testaments in the original languages, so that in his closet he seldom had recourse to any translation. His favourite study, next to the Holy Scriptures,

was oriental learning, especially the Jewish laws and customs, in the knowledge of which he had few equals.*—Mr. *Stephen Lobb*, son of Richard Lobb, esq; high sheriff of Cornwall, and member of parliament for St. Michael in that county, in 1659; (who was the pastor of an independent congregation in Fetter, London, and made a conspicuous figure among the dissenters during the reign of James II. and had a great share in the controversy with Dr. Williams;) is not to be forgotten in the enumeration of those who directed the studies of candidates for the ministry. He is said to have enjoyed every advantage of not only a pious but liberal education, first commenced in a dissenting academy, and then completed in Holland; to have possessed a discerning penetrating spirit, a firm and sound judgment, and great strength of mind; and to have united with these natural abilities a close application to study, and was a great master of the art of reasoning. These qualifications will justify us in forming a high estimate of his fitness for the province of a tutor. He died in the vigour of life, June 3, 1699.—Mr. Francis Glascock, (a gentleman, it is apprehended, of Scotch extraction, and educated in one of the universities of North-Britain,) ought to be mentioned in connection with the two preceding names. He was predecessor to Dr. Jabez Earle, as pastor of a congregation, which assembled first in Drury-lane, and then in Hanover-street, Long-acre. He died in 1706; and a few months before his death had been

* Theological and Biblical Magazine, ut ante, p. 374.

chosen, though a presbyterian, a Tuesday's lecturer at Pinner's Hall; where he delivered, as well as in his own pulpit, many elaborate discourses, which discovered not less ability, than they expressed zeal in defence of what he judged to be the great doctrines of the gospel, more especially the deity of Jesus Christ. On the occasion of the excellent Mr. Morton's being induced by the rigour of the times to seek a sphere of usefulness and a peaceable asylum in America, Mr. Glascock, Mr. Lobb, and Mr. Wickens undertook to give private lectures to the students, deprived of his assistance by his emigration, and disposed to form themselves into a class; and to others, who, through the severity of the times, were deprived of more public means of improvement. Among these, while others of Mr. Morton's pupils went to Geneva, was Mr. John Beaumont, a native of London, who received his classical education in St. Paul's school under the learned Dr. Thomas Gale, with whom his great love of learning made him a favourite. Mr. Beaumont, when he entered on the office of the minister, besides preaching with great acceptance at Fareham in Hampshire, and other places, was successful in raising and forming three congregations, one at Swallowfield in Berkshire, a second at Peckham, and a third at Battersea, in Surrey; and assisted in gathering another at Chertsea in the same county; and was afterwards 32 years pastor of a congregation at Deptford in Kent, where he died in 1730. Dr. Gale, when he was fit for the university, urged him, and held out offers to induce him, to enter in

one of the colleges at Cambridge; which he declined from conscientious scruples on conformity. He was ordained after the presbyterian model, July 1, 1689, with Mr. Hughes, of Canterbury, by Dr. Annesley, Mr. John Reynolds, Mr. Robert Franklin, and Mr. John Quick. His first settlement as a pastor was at Battersea, where he spent five years. His character as a Christian was distinguished by an holy, blameless, and inoffensive conversation, and by great patience and resignation under uncommon afflictions; and as a divine, by his zeal in asserting the doctrines that are called orthodox.*

Mr. *Benjamin Robinson*, who succeeded Mr. Woodhouse in the pastoral connection in Little St. Helen's, and was for twenty years a minister of eminence in London, dying April 30, 1724, in the early days of his ministry was engaged in the education of youth. The foundation of his qualifications for this province was laid by a considerable progress in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, under Mr. Ogden, a polite scholar, and master of a school in Derby, of which town Mr. Robinson was a native; from whose care he was removed to pursue academical studies under Mr. Woodhouse. At Findern, near Derby, where he was solemnly ordained to the work of the ministry, in Oct. 1688, he first opened a grammar-school in 1693. In this situation he was highly esteemed by many worthy clergy-

* Theological and Biblical Magazine, ut ante, p. 374—376; Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, vol. iii. p. 436, 437—445; and Dr. A. Taylor's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Beaumont, p. 43—46.

men and others on account of his learning and good sense, his unaffected piety and obliging deportment, and had offers of preferment in the national church; yet these circumstances, so honourable to his character, and so propitious to his pursuits, did not screen him from a citation into the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry's court. But his acquaintance with and personal application to Dr. Lloyd, the bishop, and who afterwards kept up an epistolary correspondence with him, soon relieved him from the trouble of this litigious process. Within a few years he removed to Hungerford in Berkshire; where, at the earnest request of his brethren in those parts, he opened an academy. This measure awakened enmity against him, and a complaint was lodged against him with the eminent prelate Bishop Burnet; who sent for him, as he passed through Hungerford, on the progress of a visitation; to whom he gave such satisfaction, both as to his undertaking and his nonconformity, as paved the way for a kind intimacy ever after. He is said to have been distinguished by a regard to the strict and genuine sense of scripture according to the best rules of interpretation. Many were educated under him for the ministry; and some younger ministers, settled in his neighbourhood, derived great benefit from the light he cast on subjects in private conferences, and at quarterly meetings held in Newbury, at which it was customary to handle on some theological subject, in which mode of discussion Mr. Robinson excelled. He appears to have been assisted in his academical

department, for a year or two, by Mr. Edward Godwin;|| who had studied under the learned Mr. Samuel Jones, at Tewkesbury, and settled as a minister in Hungerford, and became, in 1722, co-pastor with Mr. Robinson, at Little St. Helen's. To Mr. Godwin's judgment Dr. Doddridge was indebted for several important alterations and improvements in the manuscript of his "Family Expositor;" and by his friendly and assiduous services that excellent work was carried through the press. Mr. Robinson's seminary was broken up by his removal to London.

Another gentleman usefully engaged, at this period, in plans of education, was Mr. *Henry Hickman*, B. D. whom the Act of Uniformity deprived of a fellowship in Magdalen college, Oxford; on which he went over to Holland. On his return he fixed his residence in a retired situation near Stourbridge in Worcestershire, his native country. Here he opened a private seminary to read lectures in logic and philosophy. He had the character of being a man of excellent and general learning, a celebrated preacher, and an acute disputant. The titles of his publications afford a presumption of his talents as a scholar and a disputant. He was, in the latter part of his life, minister of an English church at Leyden, and died at Utrecht, in a very advanced age, in 1691 or 2. The names of two of his disciples are transmitted down to these times. One

|| Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, vol. i. p. 382; Dr. Cumming's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Robinson, p. 55, 56, 57.

was Mr. John Ball, many years the revered minister of a congregation at Honiton in Devon; where he died May 6, 1745, in the 91st year of his age: he had exercised his ministry in this town above half a century, and preached but a few days before his death with great fluency and vivacity. He was the son of a learned and excellent minister, Mr. Nathaniel Ball, ejected from Royston in Herts. He spent some time under Mr. John Short, also the son of a minister, ejected from Lyme-Regis in Dorsetshire, a man of learning, and who educated young men for the ministry at Lyme and Culliton. Mr. Ball likewise studied at Utrecht, with a closeness of application that brought on a severe illness, and a weakness of several years. He spoke the Latin tongue with great fluency, could read any book in Greek with the same ease as in English, and generally carried the Hebrew psalter into the pulpit to expound from it. He could repeat the Psalms by heart, and seldom passed a day without hearing or reading six or eight chapters in the bible. It was his usual custom to pray six times a day; a learned person, not particularly favourable to him, owned that "he prayed like an apostle." His great affability and good temper endeared him to persons of all parties; and for his general knowledge of the world, and facetious conversation, his company was esteemed and courted. He was liberal to the poor. In his pastoral duties he was peculiarly diligent and active in catechising: and had at one time above two hundred catechumens. A person remarkable for his

bias to deism said of him, "that man is what a minister should be." Mr. Ball's name will occur in a subsequent period of this history. In the persecuting times of Charles II. and James II. Mr. Ball was connived at in the education of a select number of gentlemen's sons, whose fathers did not accord with him in sentiments ; for he was greatly beloved by persons of rank and influence, as well as of different parties, in the neighbourhood.†

Another minister, who studied a short time under Mr. Hickman, and but a short time, on account of the infirmities of his declining years, was Mr. *Thos. Cotton*, M. A. born at or near Workly in Yorkshire. His father was a considerable iron-master in that county, and noted for his great hospitality and kindness to the ejected ministers ; one of whom, Mr. Spawford, ejected from Silkestone, he received into his family as tutor to his son, till his death. Mr. Cotton removed from Mr. Hickman's academy to Mr. Frankland's in Westmorland; and finished his academical course of studies at Edinburgh, about the year 1677. After this he was engaged to be chaplain to Lady Sarah Houghton, daughter of the Earl of Chesterfield, for about a year, when a severe illness obliged him to leave that situation. When he had recovered his health, he preached in his father's house, till persecution obliged him to desist. By the advice of his friends, on this account, he accepted an invitation to go abroad as

† Waldron's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Ball, p. 22, 23; and Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, vol. i. p. 191.

governor to a young gentleman ; with whom he spent three years in travelling through several parts of Europe. When they were at Paris, where during their stay they attended public worship in the English ambassador's chapel, and were greatly pleased with the useful and serious preaching of Dr. afterwards Archbishop, Wake, they received continual melancholy accounts of the deplorable state of the protestants in the southern parts of France; and they were afterwards witnesses to many very afflicting instances of persecution. Assemblies of several thousands were broken up with floods of tears; the nearest relations were rent from one another ; numberless families were utterly and barbarously destroyed; ministers were silenced, banished, or stript of all they had; some were made slaves, and some put to the most cruel deaths. The reports of the persecution all over France, which on leaving Paris they received at Lyons, were so distressing and lamentable, that they resolved to turn their course to a protestant country; and they were quickened in the execution of their purpose by the bitter reflections against the protestants, and the new insults and threatenings produced by the intelligence which reached Lyons at that time of Monmouth's rout in England. They went next to Geneva, where their sympathy was exercised, and their minds were afflicted, by frequent reports of the sufferings of the Vaudois, and the barbarities practised on them. Mr. Cotton, on his return to England, continued in the capacity of a tutor for some months, as his health was much

impaired. His income in that connection was very considerable. His prospects, if he had inclined to any civil employment, were flattering; and as he was determined for the ministry, he had the offer of a good living, with the recommendation of the former incumbent, as well as the friendship of the patron; and the overture of maintaining a reader to perform such offices as he should appoint. But he chose to take his lot with the protestant dissenters. He was first the pastor of a small congregation in Hoxton, with whom he remained, under very little encouragement, for five or six years. He then spent two or three years at Ware in Hertfordshire. He removed thence to settle with a congregation at St. Giles's in the Fields, near Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury. He was very useful and laborious; and when his health permitted, besides preaching, he expounded in the forenoon, and catechised in the afternoon. He also supplied as chaplain to the two Ladies Russell, the widows of Lord Robert and Lord James, which engaged much time and attendance. "He was a man of good useful learning, without shew; of great piety and seriousness, without austerity and moroseness; and of great regularity in his whole behaviour, without being troublesome to any body. His deportment shewed the christian, the minister, and the gentleman. He was a solid preacher, and had a very happy talent of suiting his discourses to particular persons and occasions. "From him I "learnt," said his nephew, Dr. Wright, "in a manner that I have reason to be thankful for, that

“ application is the very life of preaching. The scenes of dragooning and persecution, of which he had been a witness, made him an enemy to subscriptions to human articles of faith; and gave him a lively conviction of the necessity of maintaining the great protestant principle,—the right of private judgment. Mr. Cotton died in 1730.

* In the “Memoirs” of his travels, written for his own use, he related many affecting scenes of this kind, of which he was a spectator at Ludun, Poictou, and Saumure. At Poictou, in particular, he was exceedingly moved with the vast numbers at their last public worship, and the great difficulty with which the minister pronounced the blessing, when all broke out into a flood of tears. The last religious assembly on a lecture-day at Saumure, Mr. Cotton could never recollect without lively emotions: the congregation all in tears, the singing of the last psalm, the pronouncing of the blessing, and afterwards all the people passing before their ministers to receive their benedictions, were circumstances he wanted words to describe. The ministers and professors were banished; and he attended them to the vessel in which they sailed. The affecting sight of the vast assemblage which formed the church at Charenton, and of such numbers devoted to banishment, slavery, and the most barbarous deaths, was a spectacle that overpowered the mind. The stay at Saumure had been very pleasant, and the agreeable acquaintance they had formed in that town invited their continuance in it, till it became a scene of great danger and affliction; especially after an order was issued to require all strangers, particularly the English, to accompany and assist the severe proceedings against the protestants. When the governor received authoritative directions to see their church demolished, the tearing down of that temple was extremely distressing; the very graves were opened, and the utmost ravages committed. The destruction of it was attended with a remarkable occurrence, which Mr. Cotton recorded as an instance of the contradictory interpretations which the same act of Providence may receive, according to the different principles of those who pass their opinion on it. A person who was ambitious to have his daughter pull down the first stone of the church, had her taken from him a few days after by death. The parent and others of his

These historical gleanings concerning the academical institutions of the first Nonconformists, few and imperfect as they may be deemed, are sufficient to expose the iniquity and folly of the times. The necessity of such institutions arose from the spirit of intolerance, which had excluded from the church, and from the universities, so many men of learning and talents. The vexatious and continued prosecutions which pursued them into the retirements of science and literature, shewed a virulence and malignity of temper. It was great injustice to debar men from the honourable and pacific employment of their acquirements, genius, and intellect: an employment highly useful to the community, and in many instances necessary to the support of themselves and their families, as well as affording a solace, when silenced, as ministers. It heightened this injustice, done not to them only but to the whole body of dissenters, that the law made the universities the property of one persuasion; and rendered private

persuasion looked upon her death as a speedy call to heaven, in reward of so meritorious an act; the persecuted protestants regarded it as a just and very affecting judgment. On his journey from Poictou, Mr. Cotton was deeply impressed by the agitations of mind and the expressions of an old gentleman who came into an Inn nearly at the same instant with him, who stood leaning on his staff, and shaking his head, and weeping, cried out, "*Unhappy France!* If I and mine were but now entering into some country of refuge and safety, where we might have liberty to worship God according to our consciences, I should think myself the happiest man in the world, though I had only *this staff* in my hand." This person was found to be the eldest son of a very considerable family, and possessed of a large estate.—Dr. Wright's Sermon on the death of the Rev. Thomas Cotton, p. 34—36, notes.

academies necessary for the youth, who were excluded by the Act of Uniformity from being candidates for the degrees and preferments of those seminaries, and from the advantages of being students in them, but on the condition of conformity. This conduct was in reality repugnant to the spirit and design of the Act of Toleration. The dissenters were allowed by that act the just liberty of worshipping God according to their own consciences; and in the first instance the benefit of a ministry of their own choosing; but these severities, by which the education of their youth was obstructed, if not absolutely prevented, went to preclude them from the enjoyment of a succession of ministers of learning and ability. With great inconsistency the end was granted, but the means of attaining the end were denied to them.

As in all cases, so in this, the measures dictated by a spirit of persecution were not only unjust but impolitic. The evil and mischief was not confined to the dissenters; it affected the interests of the nation, on which it had an unfavourable aspect, by obliging the more opulent, at a great expence, and at the risk of imbibing sentiments not congenial to the English manners and constitution, to send their youth abroad for education. It affected the interests of literature. Where a competition of religious parties exists, there is a rivalry in the means of giving support to and reflecting honour on each. “While the protestant religion was publicly professed in France, learning flourished there. After the revocation

“ of the edict of Nantz, literature declined. The
“ priests having none to expose their ignorance,
“ grew lazy and sensual. Where a strict unifor-
“ mity has been required, and no dissenters tolerated,
“ it has been observed, learning is at a low ebb, as
“ in Italy and Spain.”*

SECTION II.

The different Sects of Dissenters at the Revolution.

THE name at first given to the dissentients from the Church of England, after the re-establishment of the Reformation from Popery, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was that of *Puritans*. It was bestowed by way of reproach; though it arose from a laudable desire in them to advance the Reformation, both as to the forms of worship and the discipline of the church, to a purer standard than was agreeable to the views of the dominant party of protestants, and to the taste and principles of the queen. Numbers of them were refugees, who, to escape the fury of persecution in the preceding reign, had fled into foreign countries, particularly to Frankfort. There

* Moderation, a Virtue. By James Owen. 2d part, p99,

they imbibed sentiments, which they brought into their native land, on their return to it under the auspices of a protestant princess's accession to the throne, and which involved them in those contests and divisions that gave rise to the name, and eventually terminated in a secession from the church. In early periods of the Reformation, several questions that were not consistent with the received principles and practices had been started. The scrupulosity of the venerable Dr. Hooper, on being appointed to the see of Gloucester, brought on the controversy concerning the lawfulness of the sacerdotal vestments, which had been in use during the popish establishment. Several had avowed antitrinitarian sentiments. Some had adopted and advanced opinions repugnant to the practice of infant baptism. But the questions concerning vestments and ceremonies, and ecclesiastical government, constituted the principal and leading polemics of the age; and for years all other names were lost in that of *Puritans*. The state of things ^{was} ~~were~~ changed, when the Prince of Orange came to the throne. He found the dissentients from the establishment divided into several bodies, each respectable for number and influence; and which, during the civil wars and in the reign of Charles II. had risen to importance, and asserted their distinct claims to weight in the state, and to the protection of government. These were *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Baptists*. To them was added a sect of recent origin, but who have since commanded peculiar respect, and attracted the regards of the politician

and the philosopher; I mean the Society of Friends, commonly called *Quakers*. The state of each of these sects during the period between the Revolution and the death of King William demands a particular notice.

§. 1. *Presbyterians.*

The sentiments by which this denomination of Protestants distinguished themselves, related to the church government. At the time of the Reformation, and through preceding centuries, the ecclesiastical hierarchy of England was episcopal; invested in bishops, as a distinct and superior order of Christian ministers, exercising a jurisdiction over a whole province. Presbyterianism admits of two orders of church officers only, presbyters and deacons; the former the ministers of particular congregations, and the latter the almoners or stewards. The names of presbyter and bishop, it is contended, are synonymous, and descriptive of the same office. Ecclesiastical affairs on the presbyterian plan are brought under the direction of three assemblies: the first is that of a consistory, or presbytery, within each congregation, called in Scotland a kirk session; the second a synod, or a provincial assembly, formed of deputies from the several consistories; the third a general or national assembly, constituted of deputies from the synods. Appeals lie from one to the other; but the decision of the general assembly is final.

Many of the reformed churches on the continent, when they seceded from the church of Rome, adopted this plan of church government. The exiles, who during the reign of Queen Mary had sought an asylum among them, returned to England fully possessed with a decided preference of the mode of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which they had seen in Geneva, Switzerland, and France; and with ardent desires to succeed in vigorous endeavours to introduce the same plan in England; and it was viewed with apprehension and jealousy, as the beginning of a new ecclesiastical constitution, and a model after which to raise other churches. In this temper of mind they were not disposed to meet opposition to their views, nor to acquiesce in the authority assumed by the bishops, and in that tenacious adherence to the old mode of government, as well as use of ceremonies and vestments, in which they were sanctioned by the queen. Two parties were formed on these points. The adherents to the old establishment indignantly resented the attempts of a few individuals to alter what had been settled by national synods and acts of parliament. The others resented being constrained to practise what was, in their opinion, repugnant to the purity of religion. They attacked one another by verbal reproaches and irritating writings. No measures of accommodation were pursued. Nothing was done to conciliate each other's minds.*

* Dictionnaire des Heresies, Paris 1767, vol. i. les articles, *Angleterre, Anglicane Religion.*

The Puritans, however, gained ground. The legislature being averse from their principles, and even from any further reformation, some of the leading dissidents attempted, in a private way, to introduce their favourite plan of church government; and in the year 1573 they erected a presbytery at Wandsworth, a village situated on the Thames, at a convenient distance from London. This was the first presbyterian church in England; and yet notwithstanding the court of high commission endeavoured to suppress it, they could not effect their purpose, nor prevent the formation of others in neighbouring counties.*

Their sentiments by degrees spread widely through the kingdom, and the numbers of those who embraced them were so much increased, that when the assembly of divines was convened by ordinance of Parliament at Westminster in 1643, for settling the government, liturgy, and doctrine of the Church of England, on the episcopal clergy withdrawing from it, the presbyterians constituted the majority of its members; and acted under the patronage of some of the principal political characters of the times.† Their object, in which they failed by the controversies which it created, was to lay aside the name and function of bishops, and to establish the presbyterian

* Neal, vol. i. p. 266, ed. of 1793.

† Among these patrons were Denzil Hollis, esq; Sir William Wallace, Sir Philip Stapleton, Sir John Clotworthy, Sir Benjamin Rudyard, Serjeant Maynard, Colonel Massey, Colonel Harley, and John Glynn, esq.

orm, as *jus divinum*, or a divine institution, derived expressly from Christ and his apostles. Though they were eventually foiled in this attempt, they rose to a great degree of power and influence, and carried measures very favourable to their views, after King Charles I. was in the hands of the Scots. In 1646, the presbyterian, ecclesiastical government began to appear in its proper form. The kingdom of England was divided, instead of dioceses, into provinces; every parish had its presbytery; a number of these constituted classes; for instance, the province of London was composed of twelve classes; the classes returned representatives to the provincial assembly, as the provincial did to the national. The first provincial assembly, viz. that of London, met at the convocation house of St. Paul's on the 3d of May in 1647. But the meetings of provincial assemblies under the authority of Parliament, obtained only in a few places, as in London and in Lancashire and Shropshire; but the presbyterian ministers adopting the general idea, though not invested with authoritative jurisdictions from the civil power, held voluntary associations for their church affairs in most counties. Even the county of Lancaster was not formed into a presbyterian province till February 7, 1648. A class of presbytery had been constituted by ordinance of Parliament in Shropshire, in April 1647. When General Monk, in 1659—60, restored the members secluded in 1648, who were of the presbyterian party, and filled up the Parliament, the house became entirely presbyterian; and this

fect, which had been curbed during the Protectorate, and disarmed of its coercive power of discipline, rose again into the enjoyment of all the power it had ever exercised; and the ministers of it were in full possession of all the livings in England. Their prosperity and influence were of short duration. On the restoration of Charles II. the Parliament, after having sat eight months, was dissolved, partly on the ground of its being too much presbyterian; the liturgy of the church of England was introduced again into the king's chapel, and into several churches both in city and country; prelacy was declared to be still the legal establishment, and the Common Prayer the only legal form of worship; some hundreds of the presbyterian clergy were at once dispossessed of their livings; presbytery was abolished, and the episcopal hierarchy restored to its former pre-eminence. But it is not so easy to eradicate sentiments out of the minds of men, as it is to deprive those who profess them of external emoluments and advantages. It is not so easy to exterminate, as it is to oppress a particular party. A considerable body of dissenters, the presbyterians, continued to exist under very severe deprivations and sufferings during the reigns of Charles II. and James II. to the Revolution, and with considerable reputation and influence; so as to render it, we have seen, a measure, in the opinion of many principal persons, not only just and liberal, but highly politic, in a national view, to adopt and attempt a plan of comprehension with them; and to engage that party entirely to the interests of the

court. As that scheme failed, this religious body not only fell from that zenith of power to which it had risen in the time of the commonwealth, but lost all sanction to the proceedings of their presbyteries, by ordinances of Parliament, or edicts of the state ; and were reduced to a level, in point of legal establishment, with the other sectarists ; and left with them to the enjoyment of the benefits of the same Act of Toleration.

The friend of religious liberty will not be disposed to weep over the fate of the presbyterian hierarchy. While it existed, it was only a substitute of one spiritual tyranny, of one system of coercion for another. In the room of prelates arose presbyters or elders, as lords over God's heritage. Laws were made for conscience ; the supposed doctrines and laws of Jesus Christ were enforced by penal sanctions ; and the civil magistrate was sworn to do the worst part of the work.† The Form of Directory for Worship was enforced by fines and penalties ; the use of the Common Prayer in churches, in private families, and even in the closet, was forbidden. The modest and reasonable application of the independents for indulgence and toleration was denied. The cry of the day, and the shibboleth of the dominant party, was *Covenant Uniformity*, and the *Divine Right of Presbytery*. An ordinance against blasphemy and heresy, exhibiting a long and black list of principles and tenets on which it fixed this stigma, doomed to the pains of death, without benefit of clergy, those

† Robinson.

against whom an indictment for holding any of the errors specified in the statute should be found, and who on trial did not abjure the same. It was a principle advanced in the admired assembly's catechism, that the second commandment forbids the toleration of all false religion.† It sufficiently, indeed, marks the spirit of the presbyterian government, that in a vindication of it published by the ministers and elders of London, met in a provincial assembly Nov. 2, 1649, the doctrine of universal toleration is represented "as contrary to godliness, " opening a door to libertinism, and profaneness, " and a tenet to be rejected as sole-poison."§

One of the most distinguished powers invested by ordinance of Parliament with the presbyterians was the authority to examine, and ordain by imposition of hands, those whom they should judge qualified to be admitted into the sacred ministry. The first injunction of this nature was issued to ten presbyters and members of the assembly at Westminster, and to thirteen presbyters of the city of London. Similar powers were communicated to different and various classes, by like ordinances of Parliament, through the kingdom; and numbers, under this sanction of the state, without a bishop, were set apart and introduced into the office of the christian ministry. The acting class of presbyters in the hundred of Bradford North in Shropshire, in the course of twelve years publicly ordained sixty-three ministers.

† Emlyn's Works, vol. i. p. 63, of the Narrative.

§ Neal, vol. iii. p. 146, 281, 286, 458, 459, 460, 287, note.

The narrative of the ordination of Mr. Philip Henry is a specimen of the manner in which this service was conducted by the presbyterians of that day. On applying, 6th July, 1657, to the presbytery at Prees, to be admitted a minister, he was examined, in the first place, concerning the religious state of his mind, or, in the stile of those times, concerning his experience of the work of grace in his heart; his skill in the original languages of the scriptures was then tried, by reading and construing two verses in the Hebrew bible, and two in the Greek testament. This was followed by questions in logic, natural philosophy, and theology, to ascertain the attainments he had made in human and sacred science. He was required to give his sense of a difficult text, to prove his skill in interpreting the scriptures; a case of conscience was proposed for his solution; an enquiry was made into his acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history; and lastly, a question on the extent of the Divine Providence, or “an Providentia
“DEI extendat se ad omnia?” the affirmative of which he was to maintain, was assigned to him as the subject of a thesis, which he was to compose against the next meeting. This thesis he exhibited and defended on the 3d of August; when several ministers opposed, and one presided as moderator. He then produced and left with the registrar of the class two certificates; one from Oxford, signed by Doctors Wilkinson, Langley, &c.; the other from the neighbouring ministers, &c. each attesting the regularity and exemplariness of his conversation. The

day of ordination was then appointed to be September the 6th, at Prees. Notice of this was given at Worthenbury by a paper first read in the church, and then affixed to the door the Lord's day preceding the service; signifying also, "that if any
" one could produce any just exceptions against the
" doctrine or life of the said Mr. Henry, or any
" sufficient reason why he might not be ordained,
" they should certify the same to the class, or to the
" scribe, and it should be heard and considered."

When the day came, a very large auditory was collected together. The services on the occasion commenced with a prayer by Mr. Porter, of Whitchurch: Mr. Parsons, of Wem, preached on 1 Tim. i. 12: then a confession of faith was delivered by Mr. Henry, at the requisition of Mr. Parsons; who, in a series of questions, also called upon him to express his sentiments concerning his ends in undertaking the office of a minister, and his purposes of diligence in its duties, of zeal and fidelity in defence of unity and truth, of humility and meekness in receiving admonition and discipline, of fortitude and perseverance under discouragements and persecutions, and of deportment in any future domestic connections, as well as his persuasion of the truth of the reformed religion. His answers on these points giving satisfaction, Mr. Parsons prayed; and in a prayer he and the other presbyters, Mr. Porter, Mr. Houghton of Prees, Mr. Malden of Newport, and Mr. Steel of Hanmer, laid their hands on his head, with words to this purpose, "whom we do

“ in thy name set apart to the work and office of
“ the ministry.” Five others, after the like previous
examination and trials, professions and promises, were
at the same time set apart to sustain the ministerial
character. The service was closed by Mr. Malden,
with an exhortation to the new-ordained minister.

The class gave him and the others instruments in
parchment, certifying to all these transactions, in
this form :

“ Whereas Mr. Philip Henry, of Worthenbury,
“ in the county of Flint, master of arts, hath ad-
“ dressed himself unto us, authorised by an ordinance
“ of both houses of Parliament, of the 29th of Aug.
“ 1648, for the ordination of ministers, desiring to
“ be ordained a presbyter, for that he is chosen and
“ appointed for the work of the ministry at Worthen-
“ bury in the county of Flint, as by a certificate
“ now remaining with us, touching that his elec-
“ tion and appointment appeareth: and he having
“ likewise exhibited a sufficient testimonial of his
“ diligence and proficiency in his studies, and un-
“ blameableness of his life and conversation; he hath
“ been examined according to the rules for exami-
“ nation in the said ordinance expressed; and there-
“ upon approved, there being no just exception
“ made, nor put in against his ordination and ad-
“ mission. These may therefore testify to all whom
“ it may concern, that upon the sixteenth day of
“ September 1657, we have proceeded solemnly to set
“ him apart for the office of presbyter, and work of
“ the ministry of the gospel, by laying on of our

“ hands with fasting and prayer. By virtue thereof
“ we do declare him to be a lawful and sufficiently
“ authorised minister of Jesus Christ: and having
“ good evidence of his lawful and fair calling, not
“ only to the work of the ministry, but to the exer-
“ cise thereof at the chappel of Worthenbury in the
“ county of Flint ; we do hereby send him thither,
“ and actually admit him to the said charge, to per-
“ form all the offices and duties of a faithful pastor
“ there; exhorting the people in the name of Jesus
“ Christ, willingly to receive and acknowledge him as
“ the minister of Christ, and to maintain and en-
“ courage him in the execution of his office, that
“ he may be able to give up such an account to
“ Christ of their obedience, as may be his joy and
“ their everlasting comfort. In witness whereof we
“ the presbyters of the fourth class, in the county
“ of Salop, commonly called Bradford-North class,
“ have hereunto set our hands this 16th day of
“ September, in the year of our LORD GOD 1657.”†

By the order of Parliament, on the 29th of Jan. 1644, it was required of all young ministers at their ordination to take the solemn league and covenant, which had been adopted on the proposal of the general assembly in Scotland, 9th Aug. 1643.* It was usual to certify in the ordination testimonial, that it had been taken by the person who had been set apart to the Christian ministry. It appears by the total omission of a clause to this effect in the

† Mr. Philip Henry's Life, p. 24—30, 2d ed.

* Neal, vol. iii. p. 74.

above certificate, that this requisition was not insisted on at that time. A proof of its not being uniformly a condition of ordination offers itself also from the certificate given to Mr. Henry Olland, of Bewdley, who was ordained in the church of Bartholomew, Exchange, London, 5th Aug. 1651, by Mr. Samuel Clark, Mr. Simeon Ashe, &c.; for in the printed certificate given on the occasion, the words relating to taking the covenant were erased, as he had not taken it.*

It can scarcely escape the observation of any one, that on these occasions, which related purely to the discharge of religious functions, the qualifications for the performance of which rested only in the mental and religious attainments of the person himself, and could not be communicated, and the occasions for which would depend on the election of those among whom he was to minister, a power to confer an official character was assumed: not a testimonial only to talents and moral and religious dispositions was afforded to recommend the person set apart, to attention and respect; but he was declared a *lawful* and *sufficiently authorised* minister of Jesus Christ; and the power of doing this was expressly assigned to an authority derived from an ordinance of both Houses of England. The whole business resolves itself not into a mere act of religion, and into the principles of the New Testament, but into an act of civil policy. The presbyters are the ministers of

* The copy of the Testimonial in MS. penes me, communicated by Jonathan Skey, esq; Bewdley; and Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, vol. ii. p. 526.

the state; and the presbyterian church is in a close alliance with the state.

After the Revolution, when episcopacy was restored, and presbyterianism was deprived of the distinction and influence which the state had communicated to it, the style of these testimonials underwent a material alteration, and the authoritative tone was necessarily lowered. Of this change the following certificate is an instance; given by Mr. Mansfield, ejected from Armitage chapel, Staffordshire, Mr. Edward Boucher, from Churchill, Worcesterhire, and Mr. William Turton, from Rowley, Staffordshire, at the ordination of Mr. Thos. Pickard. It runs thus: “Forasmuch as Mr. Thos. Pickard, “of Birmingham, in the parish of Birmingham, in “the county of Warwick, hath earnestly *desired to* “*enter orderly, according to the rules of the Gospel of* “our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, into the sacred “office and function of the ministry; and having requested us, whose names are underwritten, *solemnly* “*to invest him with ministerial authority;* and knowing him to be a man sound and orthodox in his judgment, of a pious and unblameable conversation, and “competently qualified with ministerial abilities, (no “exception being made against his ordination or “admission:) We have approved him, and have “proceeded solemnly to set him ~~apart to the office of~~ “preaching presbyter, and all the parts and duties “belonging to it, with fasting, and prayer, and imposition of hands; and do, *so far as concerneth us,* “*empower him to perform all the offices and duties*

“ of a faithful minister of Jesus Christ. In witness
“ whereof we have hereunto put our hands the
“ 19th day of September, 1705.”

During the short period in which the presbyterian ministers exercised the powers of ordination invested in them by Parliament, there arose a new class of ministers, who had been set apart to their sacred office by presbyterian synods, or by deputations from them, in the time of the Republic, and afterwards by assemblies of presbyters; who had not, as had many of their predecessors, received ordination from the hands of bishops. On this circumstance a question arose concerning the validity of such orders. The bishops, being re-established in the full enjoyment of episcopal jurisdiction, were ambitious to support the dignity of the powers annexed to their office; and to discredit, in the opinion of the public, the claims of an order of men, who assumed an independency of sacred character and office, though deprived of the rights which their predecessors derived from the state, and ministers of a sect again under the frowns of the nation. There could be no doubt indeed that they were legal ministers; for even in the 13th of 2d Elizabeth, any person under the degree of a bishop, though he pretended to be a minister by any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than that set forth by Parliament in the reign of Edward VI., was allowed by an Act which then passed, to qualify himself before the ensuing Christmas by subscription, &c. as therein directed; and on that ground was to be

deemed, by the ecclesiastical as well as civil laws of the realm, sufficiently called and sent to enjoy a benefice, and exercise the function of a minister of God's word and sacraments in the Church of England itself.* The recent Act of Toleration, as far as the civil magistrate can give validity to religious acts, had communicated this respectability without episcopal orders in the most extensive degree, not to the presbyterian ministers only, but to those of the other sects: "for no class of protestant dissenting ministers can easily be imagined to have existed, that is not included within some one of the descriptions recognized in that Act,† viz. persons in holy orders, or pretending to holy orders, or preachers or teachers of any congregation of dissenting protestants." But it was contended that the orders of the presbyterians were defective and invalid, in respect to the authority of the New Testament, and the efficacy of their ministrations; which were deemed null and void, because they were not ordained by the laying on of the hands of a bishop. This was a sentiment particularly calculated to exalt the episcopal priesthood, and to alarm weak and superstitious minds. It was advanced with great confidence; and became through some following years, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, a question agitated from the press. The opinion was often stated and controverted in the

* Archdeacon Blackburne's Works, vol. v. p. 294, 5.

† Joseph Smith's Observations on the Statute of 1st of William and Mary, chap. xviii. &c. p. 33. Bristol, 1804.

pulpit, at the ordinations of dissenting ministers, to vindicate their claims, and to remove the obloquy cast upon their office. It was for that period not only a new, but the chief point of controversy between the Church of England and the dissenters.

The partisans on each side of this controversy, as well as in the dispute about church government, had the same general point in view; namely, to assert and support the exclusive claims of one class of men, independently of the general body of christians, to peculiar authority and gifts as teachers of religion. The only question between them was, whether that authority supposed to be conveyed by imposition of hands were equally valid and divine when conveyed by the laying on of the hands of presbyters as of bishops. In each case the right of judging concerning the qualifications of candidates for the christian ministry, of electing to the office of preachers, and of investing them with it, is a purely clerical claim. “The people they are to preach to are not supposed “to know who are, or who are not, fit and proper “persons; but they must, as it has been expressed, “take up with such fare as their reverend caterers “provide for them. Each party contended for “a superiority of character attached to ministers. “Each party had its ecclesiastical hierarchy, or a “government by ministers; to whom the people “were expected to be in subjection. In those “countries where presbyterianism is established by “law, this is one of its distinguishing characteristics. “In the Church of Scotland, if the ministers are upon

“ a level with one another, the people are not upon a
“ level with their ministers, but in all ecclesiastical
“ matters are governed by them. To be sure the
“ lowest ecclesiastical jurisdiction is that of the *kirk*
“ *session*, where not the whole parish meet to concert
“ matters, like a vestry in England, but a few indivi-
“ duals; the minister’s own friends and whom he
“ appointed, as *deacons*; and moreover should these
“ men happen to differ in opinion from him, he
“ has only to appeal to the presbytery, and then
“ he is upon his own ground, among the *men in*
“ *black*, and has all his own way.”*

There was another sect which rose up in the times of which we are speaking, formed on more liberal principles:

§. 2. *Of the Independents.*

The sect to which we refer was that of the *Independents*; meaning to denominate by this term a religious party only, distinguished from a political body, in the times of the civil wars, whose principles on civil government being *democratical*, while their religious tenets were widely different, were also called *Independents*.

The fundamental principle of the religious sect was this: “ We are a voluntary society, and all upon
“ a level as brethren and sisters.” They deemed a national establishment of religion of any sort to be inconsistent with the New Testament idea of a

* Protestant Dissenters’ Magazine, vol. vi. p. 295.

christian church. Their minister was either one of their own body, appointed to this office by their own choice ; or, if their own choice fixed on a member of another congregation, it was a condition of his being instated in his office, that he should receive a *dismissal* from the society with which he had been connected, and commence a member of the congregation which had invited him to be their minister. Every member of the congregation, whether male or female, had a voice or vote in the choice of a minister, in the admission or exclusion of members, and in all the concerns of the church. The minister sat as president; but he was supposed to have no more influence than any other member, nor was regarded as holding a higher rank, or being invested with any superior or exclusive power. He was even accountable for his proceedings to the people; who, as they had chosen him, claimed a right to divest him at their pleasure of his office. It was required of those who desired to be received into the church, except such as had a letter of honourable dismissal from another congregation, to appear before the society, and give an account of themselves, *vivâ voce*, with the reasons why they requested to be permitted to join it; after which they were brought in, or admitted to the sacrament, the bond of their union, or rejected by the vote of the church. This last circumstance was a material mark of distinction from the presbyterian discipline; for in that, if a person would be admitted to the sacrament, he must apply to the minister of the parish, and if ap-

proved by him, his admission passed of course, without any other person's being consulted. Another distinguishing feature of the church discipline of the Independents consisted in this point, that their minister was so far from being *persona ecclesiæ*, as Blackstone denominates an incumbent, and invested with sacerdotal authority, that there was usually another person, not a minister but a layman, whom they called a *ruling elder*. His office bore a resemblance to that of the *censor* among the Romans, or the *ephor*i among the Lacedæmonians. He had the power to call the minister or any other member to account in a summary way, if the conduct of either appeared wrong; and if they did not submit to his reproof, to present them to the church for censure, degradation, or excommunication.

The churches of this denomination were properly called "congregational," in distinction from "parochial;" because they consisted of members collected from any quarter of the vicinity, more near or remote, without any regard to nominal district; and because they looked on each church as in possession of a distinct and exclusive jurisdiction over its own members and affairs, out of the controul of any other man or body of men. Even when the presbyterian government, under the authority of the civil power, prevailed in the land, this sect considered themselves as subject to no extraneous jurisdiction of presbyteries or synods, or any other church. Their creed, their ceremonial, their discipline, their finances, were settled and regulated by themselves alone, within

their own walls, without looking to any others as directors or umpires. They indeed abhorred the idea of the smallest interference from any man or society; and were truly *Independents*.†

This sect arose under Mr. Robinson, pastor of an English church, amongst the adherents to Mr. Robert Brown, descended from an honourable family in Rutlandshire, and a preacher in the diocese of Norwich; from whence he fled to Holland from the persecutions with which the Puritans were harassed towards the end of the sixteenth century, and settled at Middleburgh in Zealand. Mr. Robinson, a Norfolk divine, beneficed in the neighbourhood of Yarmouth, who became pastor of an English church at Leyden, was one of that company of exiles; and formed his congregation on the principles of independency, which he had at first imbibed from Mr. Brown. In 1604, among others who emigrated to avoid the rigorous proceedings of Bishop Bancroft, was Mr. Henry Jacob, precentor of Christchurch college; who meeting with Mr. Robinson at Leyden, embraced his sentiments concerning church discipline and government. On his return to England, soon after 1610, he formed a design, which he communicated to the most learned Puritans of those times, of forming a separate congregation on the principles of independency. In the year 1616 was laid the foundation of the first *Independent* or *Congregational* church in England, by Mr. Jacob and some others who entered into his views.

† Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, vol. vi, p. 296, 7.

They observed a day of solemn fasting and prayer for a blessing upon their undertaking; towards the close of the solemnity each of them made an open confession of his faith in Jesus Christ; and then standing together and joining hands, they solemnly “covenanted
“with each other, in the presence of ALMIGHTY
“GOD, to walk together in all GOD’S ways and
“ordinances according as He had already revealed,
“or should further make them known to them.”*

This church assembled in private for twenty or thirty years. Mr. Jacob was succeeded by Mr. John Lathorp, who had been a clergyman in Kent; who, on the congregation’s being discovered, in 1632, by the bishop’s pursuivant, and forty-two of its members being apprehended and cast into prison with their pastor, and detained in confinement two years, obtained liberty to leave the kingdom, and emigrated to New England with thirty of his adherents in 1634. On this the congregation chose Mr. Cann, author of the marginal references in the Bible, to be their pastor. After he was driven into Holland by the severity of the times, it held meetings in connection with successive ministers, under the cover of secrecy, in different places, till Jan. 1640—1, when it ventured to open its doors in Deadman’s-place, Southwark. §

During the protectorship of Cromwell, the Independents increased to great numbers, became a considerable body, and made a bold stand in the Westminster assembly against the proceedings of the high presby-

* Neal, vol. i. p. 328; vol. ii. p. 46—100. §\ Ib. vol. ii. p. 373—5.

There was another sect, who, on another ground, separated both from them and the establishment; as they disagreed with them in their views of the nature and subjects of baptism; whose history, which has commenced before this period, must be resumed here.

§. '3. *Of the Baptists.*

This body of Christians were originally intermixed with other nonconformists; and they did not begin to form themselves into separate societies till the year 1633. In 1644 there were seven congregations of them in London, and forty-seven in the country. Though the appearance of this sect was early, its progress was for many years impeded by the odium and contempt which fell upon it, and by the severities to which it was exposed from the ruling powers. During the civil wars they increased; held weekly assemblies for religious worship; and printed various treatises, not in defence of their own sentiments only, but on the general principles of religious liberty and toleration. They even petitioned Parliament, on a broad basis, “to allow public protection to private
“as well as public congregations; to review and
“repeal the laws against the separatists; to permit a
“freedom of the press to any man who wrote nothing
“scandalous or dangerous to the state; to prove
“themselves loving fathers to all good men, and so
“invite equal assistance and affection from all.” Yet they had no influence in the vicissitudes of government during the period to which we refer.

Two only of their profession, Mr. Lawrence, and Mr. John Fiennes, a son of Lord Say, till the year 1648, had seats in the House of Commons. None of them were in the Westminster assembly. Whatever weight in public affairs they might be supposed to have possessed, on Cromwell's assuming the reins of government it ceased. From the Restoration to the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, they suffered very severely in their persons, health, liberty, and property, by harassing prosecutions, heavy penalties, confiscations of their goods, and cruel imprisonments.*

The Revolution proclaimed to this as well as to other denominations of suffering dissenters security and liberty; security from fines and imprisonments, and the evils of malignant persecution; and liberty to act up, without molestation, to the dictates of conscience. The face of things being thus changed, the different sects were, as to the open profession of their sentiments, placed on the same equal footing of tranquillity and safety; and it soon appeared how ineffectual the severities of past years had been to suppress enquiry, stop the growth of opinion, and subdue freedom of mind.

The Baptists, it soon appeared, had widely disseminated their principles; and, notwithstanding the dark cloud which had repeatedly burst upon them, had gradually received a considerable accession to their numbers. For in the year 1689, a general

* See for the History of the Baptists my edition of Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. supplement 513; vol. iv. supplement to chap. 5, 6, 7, 8; and chap. 9, 10, section i.

assembly, consisting of a minister, and one principal brother of every congregation, was convened in London, on the 3d of September, by a letter from the elders and ministering brethren in the city and its vicinity, “to consider of such things that might
“much tend to the honour of God, and further
“the peace, well-being, establishment, and present as
“also the future comfort of the churches.” This letter was signed by Mr. Wm. Kiffin, Han. Knollis, John Harris, George Barratt, Benjamin Keach, Edward Man, and Richard Adams.* The representatives of more than one hundred congregations assembled together. Their first act was to appoint a general fast to be kept by all the community, and to address a letter to every congregation, representing the causes and reasons on which they recommended this act of general humiliation; drawn from the sins of the nation, the marks of declension in faith and zeal apparent among themselves, the judgments of plague and fire with which this nation had been visited, the persecution raised against themselves, and the mortality which had prevailed among their ministers. The subjects of earnest prayer which they suggested, included, besides imploring that a penitent and contrite heart might be given to them, and that they might be cleansed from the great pollutions with which they had been defiled, supplications that they might be assisted to understand and comport with the designs of Providence in respect of the latter time; that greater light might break forth,

* See the letter in Rippon's Baptist Register, vol. iii. p. 26c.

and the glory of the LORD rise upon the churches; that peace and concord might prevail through them; that in every place multitudes might be turned to the LORD; and that the lineal seed of Abraham, the poor Jews, and the gentiles, might be made one sheepfold under one shepherd, Jesus Christ.

One important measure, on which this assembly, after solemn prayer and a consideration of the state of their churches, concluded, was to raise a fund by a voluntary subscription, to be opened with all convenient speed, towards maintaining and supporting a regular ministry. This fund was designed to be applied to assist those churches that were not able to support a minister; to send ordained ministers, approved by two churches in London or the country, to visit the churches, and to preach both in the city and country, where the gospel had or had not been previously preached; and to assist any members in the aforesaid churches, “of promising gifts and “sound in fundamentals,” that were disposed for study, to attain a knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages.

The assembly also debated and decided on several questions which were proposed for discussion. One of these questions turned on a singular point of speculation, viz. the date of the *actual* justification and adoption of believers; whether it did not take place at the time of Christ's death? It was determined, that though these blessings were then infallibly secured by the gracious purpose of God, and merit of Jesus Christ, yet they did not take

effect until believers were really implanted into Jesus Christ by faith ; to which as the instrumental cause scripture attributes these benefits, while it gives such a representation of their *previous* state as is altogether inconsistent with an *actual* right to them. Eph. i. 2, 3—12.

Another question related to the case of neighbouring churches, consisting of small numbers, and incapable of maintaining their own ministry. The expediency of joining together for their mutual edification in support of the same ministry was unanimously concluded.

The extremes of ornament and fashion in the dress of the members of their churches, became also a subject of enquiry ; a reformation of every thing in attire that was not consistent with modesty, gravity, and sobriety, was urged on the attention of the elders and ministers, as a matter which it was their province to promote ; and the *brethren* and *sisters*, (for such was the language of the day,) who had solemnly professed to deny themselves, were earnestly exhorted not to conform to the fashion of the world.

When James II., with an artful design to screen and favour the papists, and sanctioned by the venal opinion of eleven out of twelve judges, affected the character of the friend of toleration ; and by exercise of royal prerogative assumed to himself the power of dispensing with the penal laws relative to religion, and published, in 1687, his “ declaration of liberty “ of conscience ;” the Baptists who had, during three

different religious establishments, sustained great sufferings, and severely smarted under the mildest of those powers, led the way in addresses of thanks to the king for the peace and liberty, to the enjoyment of which his mandate restored them.† Their address went no further than to express purely a sense of gratitude, and their joyful feelings on the occasion. Some *few* members of the community were betrayed by the insidious arts of the Court into a conduct that was more subservient to its views, and expressive of an approbation of its dispensing power. They accepted commissions as *regulators* for the support of it, and were employed by the king to go into divers counties, and to several corporations, to improve their interest to secure it countenance. But such were the just and constitutional sentiments entertained, as by other dissenters, so by the Baptists, on this stretch of the prerogative, and such the jealousy conceived of the design of administration, these tools, whether venal, or injudicious and weak only, or both, met with little or no encouragement; and some congregations not only reprov'd those who were thus employed, but commenced regular proceedings against them.

The corrupt and dastardly conduct of these agents of administration, however, though unjustly, brought reproach and infamy on the whole body; and reflections were cast upon them for hazarding, by a compliance with the popish party, the protestant religion and the civil liberties of the nation. It was

† Neal, vol. v. p. 37.

the object of the general assembly to improve the opportunity afforded them, by their association for the interests of their churches, to wipe off these reproaches by a public act. They accordingly declared, in their own vindication, “that to the utmost
“of their knowledge there was not one congrega-
“tion that had a hand, or gave consent to any
“thing of that nature, nor did even countenance
“any of their members to own an absolute power
“in the late king to dispense with penal laws and
“tests; being well satisfied that the doing thereof,
“by his sole prerogative, would lay the foundation
“of the destruction of the protestant religion, and
“bring slavery to this kingdom.” This conduct, as they intimated, was a proof of the peculiar power of virtuous, religious, and patriotic principles with them; considering the strong temptations they had been under to fall in with the king’s design, from great sufferings in the ecclesiastical courts, from the molestations of informers, from the ruin of their estates, and from the deprivation of their liberties, through the oaths and perjury of the vilest men. Warm assurances of attachment to the reigning prince, to the protestant religion, and to the liberties of the nation; and of ardent thankfulness to God, for raising up King William, in his special goodness, as his instrument to deliver us from popery and arbitrary power, concluded their declaration.

The assembly also judged fit to draw up and publish, for the satisfaction of all other christians who differed from them in the point of baptism, a sum-

mary of the doctrine of faith and practice, according to their ideas, in “ a Confession of Faith, signed by “ thirty-seven persons, in the name and behalf of “ the whole assembly;” copies of which they requested the respective churches that they represented to procure, and which they recommended to the perusal of others. This confession of faith consisted of thirty-two chapters,—on the scriptures; on God and the Trinity; on the decrees of God; on creation; Divine Providence; the fall of man; sin, and the punishment of it; of God’s covenant; of Christ the mediator of it; on free-will, effectual calling, justification, adoption, sanctification; on saving faith, repentance unto life and salvation, good works; on perseverance, the assurance of grace and salvation, the law of God; on the gospel and the extent of its grace, on christian liberty and liberty of conscience, religious worship, and the sabbath-day; on lawful oaths and vows, the civil magistrate, marriage, the church, communion of saints, baptism, and the Lord’s supper, on each distinctly; on the state of man after death, and the resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment. In support of the propositions advanced on these various topics, the margin is filled with references to texts as proofs of their truth. The outlines of this composition will obviously shew how far it deviated from the simplicity of that principle, with which the evangelical historian was satisfied to announce and prove as the discriminating article of a christian faith, and the condition of eternal life.

“ These things,” *i. e.* the works and discourses of Christ, “ were written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that ye might have life through his name.” The avowed design of this confession of the Baptists was to delineate and represent their sentiments as denying Arminianism. In this general view it corresponded with the other Calvinistic creeds of the age. It is sufficient, and it seems proper in this history, to give the reader the chapter on baptism.

1. “ Baptism,” say our professors,
 Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. “ is an ordinance of the New Testa-
 Col. ii. 12, “ ment, ordained by Jesus Christ, to
 Gal. iii. 27. “ be unto the party baptized a sign
 Mark i. 4. “ of his fellowship with him, in his
 Acts xxvi. 16. “ death and resurrection; of his
 Rom. vi. 24, “ being ingrafted into him; of re-
 “ mission of sins; and of his giving
 “ himself up unto God, through
 “ Jesus Christ, to live and walk in
 “ newness of life.”

2. “ Those who do actually pro-
 Mark xvi. 16. “ fess repentance towards God, faith
 Acts viii. 37, 38. “ in and obedience to our Lord
 “ Jesus Christ, are the only proper
 “ subjects of this ordinance.”

3. “ The outward element to be
 Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. “ used in this ordinance is water,
 Acts viii. 38. “ wherein the party is to be baptized
 “ in the name of the Father, and of
 “ the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,”

4. "Immersion, or dipping the
Matt. iii. 16. "person in water, is necessary to
John iii. 23. "the due administration of this
"ordinance."*

The principles on which this general assembly avowedly commenced and conducted their consultations and debates were liberal; friendly to candid discussion, and to the liberty and independence of the respective churches, from which it was formed. They disclaimed all manner of superiority or superintendancy over the churches; all authority and power to prescribe or impose any thing upon the faith and practice of any of the churches of Christ; and they professed that "their whole intendment was
"to be helpers together of one another by way of
"counsel and advice." They declared that in those points of principle or practice relative to communion, wherein one church should differ from another, they would not *impose* any thing, but leave every church to its liberty. They resolved not to admit any particular offence which should arise between individuals or churches to be debated amongst them, till the rule prescribed by Christ in such matters had been acted upon, and the consent of both parties had been given, or sufficiently endeavoured. No determination was in any case to be binding on any one church, without its own consent. That every counsel or advice should rest on proofs deduced from the word of God, and annexed to it.

* Crosby, vol. iii. Appendix No. ii.

It should be added, that the “Confession of Faith,” as it has been said, was supported by appeals to the scriptures; and that the whole strain of it, consistently with the principles which they laid down for their government, was merely declaratory of their own views, without any clause imposing the reception of it, or any denunciation against such as should deny or dispute the tenets it expressed, as had been usual in the determinations and creeds of synods and councils.*

Another general assembly of the elders and messengers of the churches of this denomination, from divers parts of England and Wales, was held in London, from the 2d of June to the 8th, in 1691; which was conducted by the same rules and principles as those upon which the former had acted.

Some congregations in the county of Somerset, or parts nearly adjacent, published in the same year “A Short Confession, or a brief Narrative of Faith.” This summary of theological sentiments, in which they who composed it merely state their own views, though called “short,” extended through forty-two pages in octavo, and was divided into twenty-seven chapters; the subjects of which were, “the existence
“and perfections of God, subsisting, through one
“God, in three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the
“holy scriptures; the creation; the fall of man;
“the love of God; the extent of the death of Christ;
“the gospel; the power and will of man; free grace;
“faith; repentance; baptism; the Lord’s supper; the

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 245—258.

“ work of the Holy Spirit ; justification ; sanctifica-
“ tion ; perseverance ; God’s decree, Providence,
“ or fore-knowledge ; election ; reprobation ;
“ God’s governing the world, meant principally to
“ declare the duty and obligation of christians to be
“ obedient to the governors of the world, as the
“ deputies of God, in all things of human and civil
“ concern ; but as to spiritual things, of religious,
“ ecclesiastical, or divine concern, to assert the sole
“ authority of God by Jesus Christ, who had deli-
“ vered to us his laws :” this chapter closes with a
sentiment, the liberality of which stands in an honour-
able contrast with the 18th article of our established
church.* These Baptists professed their “ belief to
“ be, that where the gospel did not come, if men
“ were governed by the law of God written in their
“ hearts, and by the works of God without them,
“ which are sufficient to teach them that there is a
“ God, and so endeavour to live to God suitably to the
“ light they have received, *no doubt but they shall be*
“ *accepted*, though they are not under the ministra-
“ tion of the gospel ; and in the great day of judg-
“ ment rewarded according to their works.” The
remaining chapters expressed their sentiments on the
questions that related to the nature and constitution
of the church of Christ, the resurrection of the dead,
the eternal judgment, the restitution of all things,
and the reign of Christ,†

* The article runs thus, “ They are to be accursed, that pre-
“ sume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which
“ he professeth ; so that he be diligent to frame his life according
“ to that law, and the light of nature.”

† Crosby, vol. iv. Appendix, No. i.

In the chapter on the church of Christ, the qualifications of persons set apart to the office of elders or ministers naturally came under consideration. That they should be suitably gifted and qualified for that office, is admitted ; but as to an acquaintance with the languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, while the usefulness of it in its place is granted, a belief is expressed that “ it is not a qualification so “ absolutely necessary to the being of a minister or “ elder, but that a person may very possibly be “ sufficiently qualified for that office without it.” The point is argued upon these principles, viz. that the gospel was first preached by unlearned men ; that this is not enumerated amongst the qualifications for the character prescribed in the scriptures : that men unlearned in the languages have, experience testifies, been very useful instruments of God in gathering churches, and in the conversion and religious edification of men : and that confining the ministry to men of learning does not bear an analogy to the method of the first planting of the gospel ; when the foolish and weak things of the world were chosen to confound the mighty, and things that are not to bring to nought things that are ; when the great things of the gospel were hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes. The well-meaning framers of the Confession then ask, with a kind of triumph, in the strain of a challenge, “ What great and good effects have we seen of “ learning ? Why should men be so fond of it ? “ Was not the apostacy brought into the world by

“learned men? Has it not been maintained and carried on by such ever since?*” In these interrogatories it escaped their attention, that the learning with which the apostacy or corruption arose, was not that of the languages critically applied to explain the scriptures, but that of the metaphysical philosophy of the Pagan schools. It escaped their recollection, that a long night of ignorance afforded opportunity for superstition to introduce its inventions, and for spiritual dominion to forge its chains; and that with the revival of learning came the Reformation. They did not anticipate, with what strength of argument, with what luminous discoveries, learning, within half a century, would emancipate the mind; nor did they reflect with what skilful, laboured, and acute investigations it had already detected and exposed the wickedness and impositions of the apostacy.

In the chapter “on the reign of Christ,” they professed their belief, that our Lord Jesus Christ, at the time appointed of the Father, will come again in power and great glory, not only to raise the dead, restore and judge the world, but to take to himself his kingdom, and reign on the throne of his father David on Mount Sion in Jerusalem for ever, as the alone visible supreme lord and king of the whole earth: that this kingdom would be universal and everlasting, peaceable and glorious: the kingdom that would succeed the fourth monarchy, and the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which shall fill the whole earth: not to be

* Crosby, ut ante, p. 32—34.

set up by the material sword, that being so exceedingly contrary to the very nature of christianity, which requires us to love our enemies and pray for them, not to destroy them ; to be subject to government in all cases of civil concern, and patiently to endure persecution. They also argued that the kingdom of Christ being spiritual ought not to be set up or maintained either by the sword or any civil power whatsoever, but by the preaching of the gospel, which is the word of God ; and not being of this world, his servants ought not to fight.

One particular in this Confession, under the title of “ the fall of man,” deserves notice. “ Our first
“ parents,” it declares, “ by virtue of the first
“ transgression, brought not only themselves, but
“ their whole posterity into a state of sin and death,
“ together with those many inconveniencies that are
“ now come upon mankind as the sad effects of
“ sin. But that this transgression did procure in
“ itself the second death, viz. in the lake of fire or
“ hell torments, either to Adam or any of his pos-
“ terity, as is by some not only imagined but
“ affirmed ; as it is a doctrine that is altogether
“ scriptureless, and so false, so it is altogether irra-
“ tional ; from whence it hath no room in our
“ faith.” In the preamble to this declaration, composed by the ministers and messengers of upwards of an hundred congregations, the design of its being published is avowed not to make an ostentatious display of superior attainments, but to bear their testimony to “ the faith once delivered to the

“faints;” and to conciliate the minds of those who looked upon them as a people degenerated from all other baptized congregations; and to pave the way, if possible, for “a more perfect acquaintance, acceptance, and fellowship with those churches, whom they believed to be one with them in the most material points of faith and practice, but who carried themselves strange towards them for want of a right understanding of their faith.” The article which we have last quoted from their “Confession,” was not calculated to meet the ideas and taste of those who entertained rigid sentiments concerning the effects of the fall of man; but it is a proof that these christians thought for themselves in this point: and as to the conciliatory end which they proposed to themselves, by their account of their faith, they expressed a becoming fortitude of mind to bear disappointment. “If, when all is done, it do not answer the end for which it is intended; but we must, notwithstanding, be looked upon as a bye-people, and be rejected or laid aside; we trust we shall keep close to the LORD in the things that we at present understand, until we are by some divine authority convinced of some religious mistakes therein.” § a declaration expressive at once of firmness of mind, and an openness to conviction.

In 1692, from May the 3d to the 24th, another general assembly of Baptists from 107 churches was held in London. To strengthen their union,

§ Crosby, vol. iv. Appendix, No. i. p. 7; vol. iii. p. 260, 261.

and to conduct their associations on a convenient plan, it was resolved, at this assembly, that, whereas, for some preceding years, the churches in several counties had held their particular associations, and one general, annually, at London, to divide this one general meeting into two; one to be kept at Bristol at Easter, and the other in London at Whitsuntide: and that after each, a narrative of the proceedings of each, as far as related to matters of general use, should be printed and circulated among the churches. It was also agreed that two messengers should be deputed from London to attend the meeting at Bristol, and two from Bristol to be present at that in London. It was agreed, with a view to render the fund for ministers and students more efficient, and to facilitate the contributions, that the churches should make quarterly collections for it in what method they judged best. It was also determined that these assemblies were not to be accountable to one another any more than churches were: that no appeals were to be made to them by the churches to determine matters of *faith* or *fact*; but that all matters referred to them for their consideration were to be laid before them under the form of propositions or queries for advice.

In the present age, when taste for sacred music is so prevalent, and the gratification of it so industriously cultivated, it will appear astonishing to many, that there ever existed, among any body of christians, a scruple on the subject of vocal music in the worship of the Divine Being. But whether it might be

partly ascribed to the want of a musical taste, or to a purely conscientious fear of corrupting the simplicity of christian worship, and of a partial reverting to the model of the Jewish service, there were some among the Baptists, in the times of which we are speaking, who objected to singing in the assemblies for public worship. A controversy on this subject was carried on in different publications by several writers. The spirit in which this question was discussed by the advocates of each side was disgraceful and irritating; for the authors of the tracts which came from the press on this occasion, loaded one another with uncharitable reflections, censures, and reproaches. When prejudice and passion, it may be supposed, had begun to subside, and the writers had grown weary, both parties agreed to refer the matter to the examination and determination of seven persons, to be nominated out of their body by this assembly. The nomination fell on Mr. Andrew Gifford, of Bristol, Mr. Edm. White, Mr. Henry Austin, Mr. Robert Keate, of Wantage, Mr. John Willis, Mr. Samuel Buttal, of Plymouth, and Mr. John Scott, as arbitrators in this dispute. The points to be submitted to their consideration were stated and limited by the following questions put to each party: viz. “Whether you
“are willing to be determined by the said brethren,
“and resolve to do what they shall determine, in
“order to the removing of all those reflections that
“are writ in all the books that are printed on both
“sides, about the controversy of singing, &c.?
“The matters to be debated and determined are

“only respecting reflections and matters of fact.”

The assembly placing the decision of the debate, submitted to review, on this basis, it is evident, did not assume an authority to decree on the merits of the question, or the force of the argument; but aimed only to reconcile the parties. This question was answered and tully agreed to by Mr. William Kiffin, minister of the congregation in Devonshire-square, Mr. John Man, Mr. George Barret, Mr. William Collin, pastor of the church in Petty-France, Mr. Benjamin Keach, minister of a congregation in Southwark, Mr. Richard Steed, of Faringdon, Berkshire, and Mr. Thomas Hollowell.

The determination adopted and recommended on this affair was, “that all concerned on both sides in
“the controversy should be desired to call in and
“bring all their books, afterwards specified by their
“titles, into the assembly, or to whom they should
“appoint, and leavethem to their disposal: that if any
“persisted in this reproachful method, they delivered
“it as their sense that the person or persons acting
“thus, who sowed offences, divisions, and discords
“among christians, should be remarked.” It was also inserted in the narrative of the proceedings of the assembly, as their determination and entreaty, that none of the members of the churches should buy, sell, give, or disperse the enumerated books, nor any others that contained the bitter reflections on their brethren.

These determinations were introduced by a serious and affectionate expostulation read with them to both parties, and signed. It ran in this strain,

“ Beloved and honoured in the LORD, for your
“ work’s sake, we your unworthy brethren, whom
“ you have chosen to examine and determine
“ the matters aforesaid, so far as we know our
“ own hearts, have singly, without respect of persons,
“ judged as for the LORD; and *unanimously* con-
“ cluded, that those persons who have been con-
“ cerned in this controversy, have on both sides
“ erred in most of the particulars that were laid
“ before us. If we have been partial in any thing,
“ it is only, for which we beg your pardon, that
“ we may lay your evils before you in easy terms,
“ from this confidence, that the grace of GOD will
“ help you much more to aggravate them in your
“ own souls; especially when you compare how
“ unlike Jesus Christ, and the holy commands he
“ hath given for brotherly love, your treatment
“ hath been one towards another; ‘who when he
“ was reviled, reviled not again;’ 1 Pet. ii. 22, 23;
“ and how far short in this *controversy* you have
“ have come in answering that character which the
“ Spirit of GOD gives of true charity. 1 Cor. xiii.
“ 4, &c. Had the things wherewith you charge
“ one another been true, we humbly conceive you
“ should have taken those rules Christ hath pre-
“ scribed, in a more private debate, way, and method,
“ that would not have reflected upon your holy
“ profession and the name of GOD, to convince
“ one another of your errors; and that the ways
“ you have taken to discover the nakedness of your
“ brethren have been irregular, and tended rather

“ to beget greater offences and stumblings, than
“ convincing, healing, and recovering. *Ham* for
“ discovering the nakedness of *Noah* was accursed
“ of God. Gen. ix. 29. ‘To proclaim one another’s
“ errors to reproach is from the evil one, and to
“ give our enemies occasion to rejoice over our
“ failings, forbidden to be told in *Gath* and *Gilgal*.
“ 2 Sam. i. 20. You know who hath said that the
“ issue of ‘biting’ will be ‘to devour one another,’
“ if God prevent not. We grieve to think what
“ dishonours your method will bring to the name
“ of God, reproach to your holy profession, stum-
“ bling to sinners, and division among the churches
“ of Christ. And therefore, as brethren, partakers
“ of the same grace, we humbly exhort you, and
“ pray God would make you all sensible of your
“ errors, humble you for them, and ‘as God for
“ ‘Christ’s sake hath forgiven you,’ so you would
“ for his name sake ‘forgive one another.’ And
“ therefore in the name of the LORD, and for his
“ sake, we entreat and determine that you proceed
“ no longer in such methods.”

By these moderate and conciliatory measures, in which not the decrees of authority but mild persuasions were employed, a stop was put to the animosities and troubles that threatened the Baptist churches; the question was separated from the spirit with which it had been discussed, and left to stand on the strength of the argument adduced; and from that time singing the praises of God in their public assemblies was adopted as a part of

religious worship by many, with whom it had not been before a practice.*

Though this assembly was formed by a deputation from 107 churches only, the Baptists were at that time very numerous, and many of them never joined in the assemblies of which we are speaking.

This denomination of dissenters resident in London and its vicinity, in 1696, when a secret scheme to assassinate King William was discovered, and his Majesty was congratulated on his deliverance from the designs of his enemies by numerous addresses, approached the throne as a distinct body, with their sentiments of joy and attachment, in an address on the 9th of April, delivered by a very respectable minister, Mr. Joseph Stennett, introduced by the Earl of Monmouth, then Earl of Peterborough. They declared, "That they gladly embraced the
" occasion to assure his Majesty that as they en-
" joyed a share in the benign influences of his
" government, whereby their *civil* and *religious*
" liberties had been so happily protected and vin-
" dicated; so they would make it their glory, as they
" accounted it their duty, to render his Majesty the
" utmost service they were capable of in that sphere
" wherein the law allowed them to move." As a further testimony of their fidelity and affection to his Majesty's person and government, they expressed their cheerful readiness "to follow the pattern of the ho-
" nourable House of Commons in subscribing to an
" association subjoined to the address." And they

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 266—270.

concluded with saying, that “ they would never
“ cease to offer up their most fervent supplications
“ to Heaven, that the spirit of wisdom might con-
“ tinue to direct all his Majesty’s councils ; that the
“ LORD of Hosts might still succeed his arms ; that
“ troops of associate angels might guard his royal
“ person ; that his Majesty might have a long and
“ happy reign on earth ; and at length wear a crown
“ of immortal glory in the kingdom of heaven.”
This address was not suffered to pass as merely a
customary form, but was much taken notice of at
the time.

A disposition to agitate the Trinitarian contro-
versy now shewed itself. Mr. Joseph Wright, of
Maidstone, a man of piety and learning, brought a
charge of denying the divinity and humanity of
Christ, unto the general assembly, against Mr. Mat-
thew Caffin, of Horsham, another minister of dis-
tinguished character and talents, with whom he had
been in the habits of intimate friendship and con-
fidential intercourse ; and he insisted upon his
exclusion both from the assembly, and from
all communion with the Baptist churches. Mr.
Wright disgraced his zeal by grounding his charge,
not on what Mr. Caffin had advanced in any publi-
cation, which would of course have been open to
animadversion and censure, but on the communica-
tion of sentiments in private conversation, in which
he had made objections to certain material parts of
the Athanasian creed.

Mr. Caffin set up a defence of himself against the
charge of holding blasphemous and heretical opinions

ungenerously brought forward by Mr. Wright.
“ He candidly acknowledged that some propositions
“ in that creed, after his most diligent and impartial
“ examination, were above his understanding ; and
“ therefore he never had, nor could then, receive it as
“ the standard of his faith. He insisted on it that
“ the holy scriptures contained all that could be
“ necessary for a christian to believe and profess.
“ He declared, that if he were catechised ever so
“ severely on them, he could not decline a free and
“ open declaration of his sentiments. He avowed his
“ belief in Christ as the ‘ Word,’ in the beginning of
“ the creation with God ; and that he was in the
“ highest imaginable sense God, consistently with
“ that most established truth, that there can be but
“ *one absolutely supreme* God. He avowed it as
“ his opinion, that Christ was the ‘ God over all,’
“ intended by Paul, which he thought conformable
“ to our Lord’s own declaration concerning him-
“ self. He confessed his belief that Christ, as to
“ his *flesh*, was the seed of the woman, the son and
“ offspring of David, conceived indeed miraculously,
“ but born of Mary in the same natural way as
“ other men. He pleaded that it had been his study
“ and delight to exalt and honour his Saviour,
“ both as God and man, to the highest degree of
“ thought : that he had never disturbed the minds
“ of any christians about unrevealed sublimities, but
“ left to every one the same liberty of judgment
“ which he claimed for himself ; and while he
“ owned that he was far enough from perfection

“ in knowledge, he appealed to his friends, as well
“ knowing that he was always open to conviction,
“ and thankful for every addition of new light.”

It reflects honour on this assembly, which was numerous, that this truly protestant and ingenious defence gave general satisfaction; and Mr. Wright was much discountenanced for his unbecoming reflections and his want of candour.

A general assembly was, at a short distance of time, held at Aylesbury, in the county of Bucks. Here Mr. Wright engaged the concurrence of another person, to exhibit again his charge against Mr. Caffin; but again was disappointed in his views: for this assembly also dismissed the accusation, and resolved, notwithstanding a difference of sentiments on some abstruse *unrevealed* points, to maintain amity and friendship with Mr. Caffin.

Mr. Wright, chagined with his disappointments, and feeling the inefficiency of his influence, withdrew from the assemblies, and protested against their proceedings. But the seed of contention which he had sown sprung up, and in other quarters there arose new accusers of Mr. Caffin. The churches in Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire exhibited similar charges against him to the assembly convened from them, and moved that he should be brought to judgment. He explained himself with great meekness and condescension, and laboured to recover their good opinion, but without success. Their complaints were renewed, and a hearing was again demanded; and the assembly agreed that at Whit,

sun- tide next year, 1700, his case should be fully examined. It met at the time fixed: Mr. Caffin attended, and to prevent confusion and tedious debates, a committee of eight persons, four of whom were on the side of the complainants, was chosen to confer with him, and to draw up a general determination, which, being assented to and signed, might be a sufficient ground of union. This was done, and the following declaration, after it had been read several times, received the signature of all who were present, and was published by the complainants, viz.

“ According to the trust reposed in us, we offered
“ to the assembly, that it be agreed, that Christ, as
“ he was the *Word*, is from the beginning; but in
“ time that *Word* took not on him the nature of
“ angels, but took on him the seed of Abraham;
“ and as such is *Emanuel, God with us, or God mani-*
“ *fest in the flesh*: and as he is the *Word*, is one with
“ the Father and the Holy Ghost. And as he was
“ *God manifested in the flesh*, so he is the Jesus that
“ *tasted death for every one*. And further, whereas
“ there have been, and yet are, debates about the
“ MOST HIGH GOD, we conceive He is one
“ infinite, unchangeable, and eternal spirit, incom-
“ prehensible Godhead, and doth subsist in the
“ Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.

“ WM. GOOCH,
“ BENJ. MILLER,
“ THOS. KIRBY,
“ DAVID BROWN,

“ WM. VINCENT,
“ JOHN HASSUM,
“ JOHN AMORY,
“ NATH. GALE.”

It was also entered in the journals of the assembly, “That the defence brother Matthew Caffin has made, together with his acknowledgements, are to the satisfaction of the assembly.”

This vote, though it breathed the spirit of peace and tolerance, had not immediately its desired effect. At the next meeting of the general assembly, the churches in the county of Northampton lodged a complaint, that Mr. Caffin had not been tried to their satisfaction. After a deliberate debate, a motion was made, put to the vote, and carried by a great majority, “that the declaration made by Mr. Caffin, and his signing the aforesaid expedient was sufficient and satisfactory.” Notwithstanding this conciliatory resolution passed, the dissatisfied did not acquiesce in it; but cherishing the uneasiness which rankled in their breasts, forsook the assemblies of their brethren, and held for some years separate associations; till at length, after some essays, a friendly union was accomplished on a sure foundation of forbearance and charity,—an adherence to the scriptures only as the *complete* and *only* rule of faith and practice. It was a sign of the ill-nature and dislike which the separatists indulged on this occasion, that the assembly from which they withdrew was, for a short time, called *Caffinite*.†

From the time of the Reformation a practice of holding public disputations on the theological questions on which the parties of the times differed, had existed in Europe and in England. They were

† Crosby, vol. iii. p. 280—285.

sometimes appointed by royal proclamation, not so much with the candid design of investigating the truth, as with the hope of gaining a triumph over those who ventured to dissent from the religious principles and injunctions which the power of the state had legalized. This mode of settling controversies on points of faith or practice was at other times voluntarily adopted by partizans of each side, without the authority of the magistrate or the protection of power. The principles of the Baptists were repeatedly brought to this discussion and trial. The first disputation on them was holden in Southwark, 17th Oct. 1642, between Dr. Featly, Mr. Kiffin, and others. The next took place in London, in the year 1643, at different times and through several weeks, between Mr. Knollis, Mr. Kiffin, and Mr. Jeffrey. A third was conducted at Tirling in the county of Essex, on 11th Jan. 1643, by Mr. John Stalham, Mr. Newton, Mr. Gray, Mr. Butt, and Mr. Thomas Lambe. Mr. Gibbs and Mr. Richard Carpenter held a disputation, about the year 1647, before a great assembly of ministers and others, in the parish church of Newport-Pagnell. Mr. Samuel Fisher, and several clergymen, on July 26, 1649, engaged in such a verbal discussion at Ashford, in the county of Kent. On a challenge given by Mr. Baxter, this mode of stating and defending their respective opinions was adopted by the learned Mr. Tombes, on Jan. 1st, 1649, in the parish church of Bewdley. On 2d May, 1652, a disputation of this kind was holden at Cork, in Ireland,

between Dr. Harding, Dr. Worth, and Mr. Murcott. Mr. John Craig, Mr. Henry Vaughan, and Mr. John Tombes engaged in a similar debate at Abergavenny in the county of Monmouth. Portsmouth was the theatre of the last of these contests ; which, though they might draw attention to the questions controverted between the parties, and lead some persons to enquiry, unhappily tended more to inflame the passions of the disputants, and to excite an eagerness for victory, than to elicit the truth. This disputation was holden, with his Majesty's licence, on February 22, 1698. The disputants on the side of the Pædobaptists were Mr. Samuel Chandler, of Fareham, and Mr. Leigh, of Newport ; and Mr. Robinson, of Hungerford, was their moderator. The ministers who advocated the principles of the Baptists were Dr. William Ruffel, of London ; Mr. John Williams, of East-Knoyle ; and the moderator, Mr. John Sharp, of Frome. The disputation was conducted in the old mode of the schools by syllogisms. Two questions came under discussion in this debate. First, “ Whether according to the commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, *adult* believers are the only proper subjects of *baptism*, and not *infants* ?” Secondly, “ Whether the ordinance of *baptism*, as appointed by Christ, is to be administered by *dipping*, plunging, or overwhelming only, and no otherwise ?” It began at ten in the morning, and lasted till between the hours of six and seven in the evening ; when after much

advanced on both sides about words to no profit, and so as to create a confused jangling and noise, Mr Williams, a presbyterian minister, as were all the Pædobaptist disputants, said he thought there had been little said to the purpose. To whom Dr. Russell replied, "Mr. Williams, I think there hath been a great deal said, more than hath been answered; but if you are not satisfied, we will wave all that hath been said, and I will dispute it over with you *de novo*." Mr. Williams, with a shrug, declined this challenge, saying he was not well. Upon which it was judged proper to close the disputation. Each party having addressed the governor and mayor with their thanks for the civility shewn to them, Mr. Leigh concluded with prayer, and dismissed the assembly. One of the public prints, called the Postman, on the 25th of February, declared the victory to be on the side of the Pædobaptists; and charged Dr. Russell with employing all the subtlety and sophistry of the schools in the management of the argument against infant baptism. From this charge it was inferred that he handled the subjects of debate with the dexterity of an able disputant, and pressed his opponents with no mean and contemptible arguments. A partial account of it, accompanied with misrepresentations and unhandsome reflections, appeared in the "Flying Post" of the 1st of April. It was an instance of disingenuous or uncandid conduct in the scribe of the Pædobaptists, that when the scribe on the side of the baptists went to propose comparing with him their respective

minutes, he refused it; and no applications could procure from him even a sight of his papers: he pleaded that his copy was very imperfect, as he had never before been engaged in such an office. Dr. Ruffel submitted to the judgment of the public the decision on which side the victory lay, by giving the disputation from the press, in a tract, entitled, “A true Narrative of the Portsmouth Disputation, between some Ministers of the *Presbyterians* and others of the *Baptist* persuasion, concerning the subjects and manner of Baptism.”† About three months afterwards, the Pædobaptists published their own account of it; which they confessed was imperfect, and in which others detected several insertions, transpositions, falsifications, and additions.

About this time Mr. Pilkington, a Benedictine monk, renounced popery, and embraced protestantism under the form of profession observed by the baptists. This event, by its unusual and singular nature, may be supposed at the time to have created an interest in the public mind, and to have called the attention of men to the denomination of christians, to which, under so remarkable a change of sentiments and religious profession, Mr. Pilkington joined himself; and on these grounds may have a claim to be noticed in this history. His education at first was conducted by some Romish emissaries in England; under whose tuition he spent five years and a half. The proficiency which he had made in an acquaintance with the principles of the catholic faith during

† This narrative is preserved by Crosby, vol. iii. p. 314—353.

that period, induced the friends of it to send him to the English seminary at Lisbon, to perfect his qualifications for sustaining the character of a missionary. Here he spent three years and upwards, imbibing erroneous notions concerning protestantism, and almost insuperable prejudices against it. Regarding it as a dangerous heresy, more effectually to secure himself from being drawn into it, he resolved to relinquish the design of becoming a missionary priest, and to betake himself to a religious state. With this view he made interest with the monks of a certain order, and obtained their consent to be admitted to their habit. When the president of the college heard of it, unwilling to lose one of his flock, and fearing that Mr. Pilkington's friends, who designed him for other ends, would resent the step, he put a stop to the design by frequent applications to the Pope's nuncio. The disappointment created great animosities between the two religious houses; and so exasperated the mind of the young candidate for the habit of a monk, that he refused obedience to the constitutions of the college; and though he had no doubt but that his conduct would highly disgust his friends, he requested a dismissal from it, in order to return to England.

In this state of his mind he resolved to search into the doctrines of the church of England, under a sanguine hope, that if he could persuade himself of the possibility of salvation out of the church of Rome, he should meet in England with other friends to maintain him at one of the universities. In

purfuanee of this refolution he communicated his intentions to Mr. Colbatch, chaplain of the Englifh factory, with whom he had converfed feveral times on controverted points in religion, and requested his recommendation to fome of the clergy in England. This gentleman favoured his views by writing to the Bifhop of Salifbury's chaplain, whom, on his arrival at London, he unfortunately found out of town; but on applying to fome other clergymen he was introduced to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The encouragement and patronage afforded him at this juncture fo diffipated his fears and animated his intentions, as to difpel for the prefent all apprehenfions for his foul's future ftate; and fascinated by the rifing hopes of preferment, he forgot the refolution he had made of not forfaking the Romifh communion till he was convinced of the poffibility of falvation out of it. Under this fhort retreat of prejudice, and led away by feducing profpects, though he had fcarcely begun the fearch after truth, he thought he had found it, and was hasty to poffefs it. Upon requesting to take orders in the church he was fent to Oxford. Here his former prejudices revived; doubts and fcruples to the difadvantage of proteftantifm arofe in his mind; vain were his attempts to ftifle thefe thoughts; the civilities he received at the univerfity, though far above his expectations, were bands too weak to attach him to the place; the preferments promifed to him, though confiderable, could not afford peace to his mind. Having fpent four terms in the univerfity,

he returned to the church of Rome. On his re-admission into that communion, he submitted to the penance of a pilgrimage from London to Holy-Well in Wales, on foot, and by begging. After eighteen months, peace being concluded with France, he was admitted to the habit of a *Benedictine* monk in the English monastery of St. Edmund in Paris; in which he continued nearly a year.

In this place new views were presented to his mind; and his temporary connection with this religious order, eventually led him to be in reality, what he had been before but in effigy, a *protestant*. The representations which he had read, and the reports which he had heard of the professors of this faith, inspired him with an unusual curiosity to observe, and narrowly to inspect, their practices. The post of secretary to the convent, which on account of the great age of the secretary he supplied, afforded him favourable and peculiar opportunities of noticing the manners of the house. All things, to his great surprize, ran counter to his expectations. The whole family he discovered was divided into factions and parties; ambition, pride, and self-love marked the characters and deportment of the individuals of the order; instead of hospitality and real poverty, nothing was to be seen but insatiable avarice and thirst after riches. In the place of boasted temperance, excess and gluttony, to avoid public scandal, were practised in private: and instead of reserved and abstemious manners, the general and other superiors had their parties of young females,

whom they regaled with wines and luxuries, in a close chapel of the church. The obedience of the order appeared most in obeying their own unbridled lusts and passions. In a word, “it seemed to me, he declares, “their chief study was, which of them “should be most wicked at home, and yet be thought “the most holy abroad ; that is to say, who should “most genteelly play the hypocrite.”

Though these practices and examples raised his disgust, and exposed him to great temptations, yet the attachment to a monastic life which he still retained, inclined him to believe that he could live up to the rules of the order, though very severe, which others allowed themselves the liberty of breaking. This consideration had almost determined him to continue in this connection, when taking a bible into his hands, he cast his eyes on the 22d verse of the 9th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians—“I therefore so run, not as uncertainly ; “so fight I, not as one that beateth the air.” This passage, the impression of which on his mind was strengthened by another that occurred to his thoughts, from the 12th verse of the 1st chapter of Isaiah, viz. “Who hath required these things at “your hands ?” produced various doubts and apprehensions in his mind, and an agitation which permitted him to take little rest day or night. After frequent contests with himself for and against the exercise of those mortifications and austerities which the rules of the house enjoined, he began to reflect on the reasonableness and weight of Christ’s decla-

ration, "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants:" another of the Apostle Paul, "That the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared to the glory that shall be revealed in us," also much affected him. The train of his thoughts led him to a conviction that the Romish doctrine of merit, and the efficacy of works of supererogation, was highly derogatory to the honour of Christ. When he witnessed the expressions of the far greater veneration paid to the Virgin Mary than to her Son, by pulling off their hoods, by kneeling down, and by lighting the candles on the altar when they sang anthems to her, (practices not observed in other parts of the service,) he was persuaded that their saints' worship fell under the same censure. As his former prejudices yielded to the spirit of enquiry, these and other discoveries concerning the practices and principles of the Roman Catholic religion led him to examine all its other doctrines. The result of this investigation was a conviction that the greatest part of them was repugnant to the word of God; and he reflected with great astonishment that he had not sooner discerned the errors and superstitions of the Catholic church, which he now began to look on as abominations.

To fortify his mind against any temptations to a second relapse, he formed a firm, deliberate resolution to shut his eyes against all doctrines that could not be plainly proved from the scriptures; and laying aside all motives of interest, to join in communion

with that church, whose opinions and worship should, on examination, appear to him most conformable to them. In pursuance of these purposes he returned to England; he attended on the sermons of the clergy of the established church, and of the dissenting ministers of different denominations; he candidly and seriously read their publications; and perused with particular attention the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, not without a wish to find them in all points so agreeable, in his judgment, to the scriptures, that he might with satisfaction to himself have sat down in that communion, in which he would have rejoiced. But insuperable objections offered themselves to his mind. He could not assent to the 34th article, on the traditions of the church; nor the 35th article, of homilies; nor to the 36th, of consecration of bishops and ministers. He could not admit the claim advanced in the 20th article, that the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. He also could not agree with the clause relative to infant baptism, in the 27th article. On these grounds he desired to be admitted into the communion of the Baptists, whose doctrine and worship, in his judgment, came nearest to the holy scriptures.†

Mr. Pilkington was baptized by the Rev. John Piggott, minister of the congregation in Little Wyldestreet, Lincoln's-Inn fields; who, on the occasion, first addressed him in the presence of the church, and before a numerous auditory, with a solemn

† Crosby, vol. iv. Appendix, No. ii.

charge to “speak nothing but the truth” in declaring the change of his sentiments, and stating the grounds and motives of his conduct: he also earnestly bespoke a candid and impartial attention from the auditory to the account which they were to receive from Mr. Pilkington, of the manner and means of his conviction, and of the reasons which induced him to withdraw from the worship and communion of the church of Rome. This was done by his reading a narrative, from which the preceding history is drawn. He then in a solemn recantation professed his full conviction of all the palpable errors, corruptions, and novelties of the church of Rome, both in doctrine and practice; and his utter abjuration of the same with great abhorrence and detestation, particularly its tenets concerning the infallibility and supremacy of the bishop or church of Rome, as grossly intrenching on the prerogatives of God. §

These acts in the proceedings of the occasion shew that due caution and deliberation were exercised on it, and that a zeal for proselytism did not betray the Baptists into a neglect of obtaining satisfaction concerning the sincerity of the convert, and the intelligence and judgment with which he acted.

In September, 1701, King James died at St. Germain's in France, above twelve years after his exile, and after frequent unsuccessful attempts to regain the crown. On this the French king, contrary to the advice of his ministry, proclaimed the pretended Prince of Wales king of England; and

§ Crosby, vol. iii. p. 353, 4, 5; vol. iv. ut supra.

exerted his interest with other courts, in which he had ministers, to engage their princes to own him in the same character. This conduct of Lewis XIV. gave universal disgust. King William looked upon it as an open violation of the treaty of Ryswick; the nation felt high indignation at seeing a foreign power, with which it was then at peace, pretend to declare who ought to sit on the English throne; and expressed their resentment in numerous addresses to the king of their own choice from all parts of the kingdom. The Baptist ministers in and about the city of London, as a distinct body, followed their fellow-subjects in these testimonies of loyalty and affection. Their address was presented to his Majesty at Hampton-Court, on Dec. 21, by Mr. Stennet, introduced by the Right Honourable the Earl of Peterborough. In this address, besides general declarations of attachment to the king, and of solicitude for the settlement of the succession to the throne in the protestant line, they delivered their sentiments on the particular object of the address in the following manner; speaking for themselves and for their several congregations, they said, “As we
“cannot forget what difficulties and dangers your
“Majesty has generously encountered and gloriously
“overcome, in delivering and protecting these
“kingdoms from popery and arbitrary power, so
“we conceive a just indignation against the late per-
“fidious and presumptuous conduct of the French
“king; who, not content to enslave and persecute
“his own people, aspires to give kings and laws to

“ other nations, and has taken upon him to own and
“ declare the pretended Prince of Wales to be king
“ of these realms, of which your Majesty is the only
“ lawful and rightful fovereign.”*

Mr. Stennet, about this time, appeared also as the advocate of the whole body with which he was connected, by defending their discriminating opinion and practice in religion from the press. They were attacked in a work, entitled “ Fundamentals without a foundation, or a true picture of the Anabaptists,” by David Ruffen. The design of this treatise was not only to controvert, but to reproach the principles of the Baptists. Mr. Stennet replied to this writer, without discovering the least appearance of anger or resentment, in an easy and pleasant strain, with much learning and solid reasoning, mixed with fine turns of wit, which were natural to him.†

While the Baptists derived their denomination from one common principle concerning the nature and design of baptism, there was a variety of sentiment amongst them on several theological points, which gave birth to different sects; particularly two on doctrinal opinions, distinguished by the denomination of *Particular* and *General* Baptists. The former were understood to coincide in their sentiments with Calvin; particularly on the doctrine of absolute and personal or individual election. The latter, or General Baptists, entertained those views of the divine decrees, and of the extent of the scheme of salvation, which had been advanced and defended

* Crosby, vol. iii, p. 357, 8. † Idem, p. 369,

by Arminius and his adherents, and embraced the doctrine of general redemption. Among each of these denominations there were some congregations who derived the discriminating name of *Sabbatarians* from their religious observance of the seventh day of the week, as a day of rest and social worship, in conformity to the fourth commandment, which they considered as obligatory on Christians. Mr. Francis Bampfield, a student in Wadham college, Oxford, and ejected from Sherborne in Dorsetshire, formed a church after this, at Pinner's hall in London, on the sabbatarian principle, of which he was a zealous assertor.* The Baptists of these different classes observed, in general, the same rules of church government as the other protestant dissenters; except that they admitted none, at that period, to communion with them in the Lord's Supper, who had not made the personal profession of the christian faith by immersion. Of latter years some of their congregations have relaxed their discipline in this respect, and allow of mixed communion; and receive to the Lord's Supper those who differ from them on the questions concerning baptism; acting on this principle, that Christ only is our master, and that every man must, from the sincere and impartial study of the New Testament, form his judgment on the christian doctrine and institutions of the gospel, and not from an implicit or careless deference to the ideas and notions of other men.

* See the Author's edition of Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. p. 610, 611, and note †.

The Baptists had, and in some parts of the kingdom still continue, an office peculiar to themselves: it is that of messengers, or angels of the churches; using the word in its original primary sense. They are looked upon as superior in rank and dignity to common pastors. To this office is attached the power of visiting the churches through certain appointed districts, containing, perhaps, several counties. At ordinations, if one of these angels or messengers be present, he ordains by laying on his own hands only; and thus qualifies the person ordained to be a messenger, wherever he is chosen to that office. But if the persons elected to it have received ordination only from common pastors, he must be ordained again by one or more of those angels, before he can himself act in that capacity. The most able, useful, and active ministers are elected to visit the churches, and to exercise a kind of general superintendency under that name. It is apprehended that Titus, Timothy, and Sylvanus were messengers in the earliest times of christianity. They rest the origin and authority of the office, particularly on the apostolic declaration, 2 Cor. viii. 3, "Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner
"and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren
"be enquired of, they are the messengers of the
"churches, and the glory of Christ."† On such grounds they argued for the *jus divinum* of the

† Crosby, vol. iii. p. 273; Thompson's MS. Collections, penes me, vol. i. article Boston in Lincolnshire; Evershed's Sermon, entitled, "The Messengers' Mission," preached at Canterbury at the ordination of messengers, July 29th, 1783.

messenger's office. The Baptists had also, amongst some of their churches, the custom of receiving into their community newly-baptized persons by imposition of hands, as a tradition and practice derived from the apostles, and as an early and invariable method of admitting members into the church of Christ; this custom they reckon one of the six fundamentals or "principles of the doctrine of Christ," enumerated Heb. vi. 1, 2.

From this survey of the general history of the Baptists during the period between the Revolution and the death of King William, our plan leads us to notice those individuals who, at that time, appear to have been particularly esteemed and regarded by them as men of talents and influence.

Amongst these was *Mr. William Kiffin*, who began his ministry with the Independents; but afterwards taking a part in the conferences that were held in the congregation of Mr. Henry Jessey, when the majority of them adopted the sentiments of the Baptists,* Mr. Kiffin at that time changed his opinion, and joined himself to the church of Mr. John Spilsbury. A difference arose between them about permitting an individual to preach to them, who had not been initiated into the christian church by immersion; as if the conscientious omission, on one side, of a right considered as an institution of Christ by the other party, could vitiate the functions of the minister: or as if a mutual indulgence to the dictates of conscience could be a criminal

* See Neal, vol. iii. p. 517.

connivance at error. On this point these good men parted, but to their credit they kept up a friendly correspondence. Mr. Kiffin became the pastor of a baptist congregation in Devonshire-square, London. After the Restoration he had great influence at court, both with the King, and Chancellor Hyde; and possessing opulence, is reported to have supplied his Majesty, on pressing emergencies, with a present of ten thousand pounds. He improved his interest with the king to obtain an order for the examination, in council, of a scurrilous and malignant pamphlet, meant to defame the Baptists, entitled "Baxter baptized in blood."* Another effect of his influence was the pardon of twelve baptists, who were condemned to death at Aylesbury, for refusing to conform to the established church, under a clause in the conventicle act of the 35th of Queen Elizabeth, by the justices of the county at a quarter sessions: a proceeding which surprized the king, who could scarcely believe that any law to justify putting his subjects to death for religion only could be in force.† Mr. Kiffin himself had, in the time of the Commonwealth, been prosecuted under the ordinance of Parliament, enacted, with a designed reference to Mr. Riddle, for punishing blasphemies and heresies. On the 12th July 1655, he was summoned before the Lord-Mayor, and charged with a breach of this ordinance, by preaching that "the baptism of infants was unlawful." That magistrate

* See Neal, vol. iv. p. 477.

† Crosby, vol. ii. p. 181; and vol. iii. p. 5.

being busy, the execution of the penalty incurred was referred to the following Monday.* The influence which he had at Court, instead of abashing malignity, provoked it, and increased the number of his enemies, and they formed a design upon his life; which coming to his knowledge by a letter that was intercepted, he was so happy as to escape. He and Mr. Knollys advocated the principles of the Baptists against Dr. Grew and Dr. Bryan, in a disputation held at Coventry; in which both sides claimed the victory, but which was conducted with good temper and great moderation, and closed without any diminution of friendly regards. Mr. Kiffin lived to be very old, and preached to the last. He was a man of considerable parts, had learning, and was an acute disputant. It is a sign of his weight, and of the estimation in which he was held by the religious and political communities, that he was one of the five baptists, who were made aldermen by King James II. when he deprived the city of London of its charter.†

Another individual, who obtained distinction among the baptists of that day, and was the author of a Treatise in 4to. on the subject of baptism, was *Mr. Thomas Patient*, who began his ministry among the Independents in New England; but by his own reflections in reading the scriptures, was led to conclude that infant baptism had no foundation in them. This change of sentiments provoked the resentment of his brethren, and exposed him to much

* Crosby, vol. i. p. 215. † Id. vol. iii. p. 3, 4, 5.

suffering, and which induced him to emigrate to England; where he became co-pastor with Mr. William Kiffin. He accompanied General Fleetwood to Ireland, and settled there; and after Dr. Winter was removed by the General, usually preached in the Cathedral. The interest of the baptists was much advanced by his labours in that kingdom, and he is thought to have formed the baptist church at Cloughkeating; which in the year 1740 consisted of between two or three hundred members, united in one communion, though some were of the *general* and others of the *particular* persuasion. This church was implicated in the prosecutions which followed the suppression of Monmouth's insurrection; and the minister and all the members were tried for their lives. The foreman of the jury swore, before he went into the court, that he would not leave it till he had brought them all in guilty: a rash and profane way of prejudging a cause. As soon as he entered the court he died: and the rest of the jury acquitted them.*

There did not arise among this denomination of christians a more remarkable character, in many respects, than *Mr. John Bunyan*; who was born of honest but poor parents, at Elstow in Bedfordshire, in 1628. His father was a tinker: his education consisted only in being taught to read and write; and after he was grown up, he followed his father's occupation. In 1645 he served as a soldier in the Parliament's army at the siege of Leicester. In his

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 43.

youth he was very vicious, and greatly corrupted the manners of his young companions. He became at length a thoughtful and pious man. Different incidents seem to have awakened the principle of conscience in his breast, and to have led him into deep, serious, and penitent reflections. The reproof of a woman, a notoriously wicked character, addressed to him with sharpness, when he was cursing and swearing in a vehement manner, and reproaching him as able to spoil all the youth in the town, filled him with shame, and determined him to refrain from that profane practice. An accidental conversation with a poor man on religion induced him to apply himself to reading the scriptures ; which was followed by such a reformation, both in his words and life, that the change in his manners filled his neighbours with astonishment, and converted their former censures of his conduct into commendation and praise. A casual conference also with four poor women, into whose company he fell at Bedford, on the subject of the new birth, left very serious impressions on his mind. He himself, it appears, ascribed his conversion, principally, or in the first instance, to a sudden voice from Heaven, saying, “ Will thou leave thy sins, and go to heaven; or have “ thy sins, and go to hell ?” and accosting him when he was at play with his companions. This excited such an astonishment, that he immediately left his sport, and looking up to heaven, whence the voice seemed to come, he thought he saw the Lord Jesus looking down upon him and threatening him with

some grievous punishment for his irreligious practices. This supposed phænomenon indicated a state of mind: previously much agitated and affected with conscious guilt, aided by the force and vivacity of an imagination strongly tinged with enthusiasm, of the influence of which his history affords various instances; for on other and future occasions he conceived that he saw visions and heard voices from heaven. The turn of his thoughts, and the natural power of fancy, presenting images suitable to his remorse and fears, were as really the means which a gracious Providence employed to bring him to repentance, and the effect was the same, as if a real supernatural impression had been made on his ear, or a miraculous scene had been presented to his eye. He became a man of sincere piety and blameless morals; though the latter did not screen him from malicious and groundless calumnies; and the former was unhappily accompanied with great bigotry and a censorious spirit. When he married, he was extremely poor, not having so much furniture as even a dish or a spoon, and all the portion his wife brought him, consisted in two books, “The plain Man’s Path-way to Heaven,” and “The Practice of Piety.” After his conversion he was baptized by Mr. Gifford, the minister of the baptist church, in Bedford, and admitted a member of it about the year 1655.* His

* Long before the year 1650, there were in this town and neighbourhood pious persons, who felt a detestation of episcopal superstition and tyranny, and united in searching after nonconformists, called in that day *Puritans*. The chief among these were

talents and gifts and religious spirit attracted the attention of this congregation, amongst whom he for some time gave a word of exhortation, or led their worship, till they called him to the character of a public minister, and set him apart to that office by fasting and prayer. He was a popular preacher, and generally spoke with much fluency and with great effect. A Cambridge scholar, who afterwards became a very eminent minister in the county, is particularly mentioned as an instance of the power and

the Rev. Mr. Man, Mr. John Grew, Mr. John Elton, and Mr. Anthony Harrington. They neither were nor desired to be formed into a church; but were zealous to edify each other, and to promote the gospel by their liberality and friendship. Always keeping a door open, and a table furnished, for those ministers and christians who evinced a zeal for the purity and practice of religion. About the year 1650 came among them Mr. John Gifford, a native of Kent, who had been a great royalist and a major in the king's army; but had been recently under deep religious impressions, and had commenced preacher. His labours in that character were acceptable, and successful in awakening in the minds of some a religious concern, and in engaging these friends of piety to form themselves into a church, of which he was chosen the pastor or elder.

“ The principles on which they entered into fellowship one
“ with another, and on which they received new members into
“ their christian association, were *faith in Christ* and *holiness of life*,
“ without respect to this or that circumstance of opinion in outward
“ or circumstantial points. By these means faith and holiness were
“ encouraged, love and amity were maintained, disputing and
“ occasional janglings were avoided, and many that were weak in
“ the faith were confirmed in the principles of eternal life.”* In
consistency with the large basis, on which this church was constituted, its next minister, Mr. Bunyan, was an advocate for the mixed communion of christians, who differed in opinion on the questions relative to baptism.

* Thomson's Collections, vol. i. Bedford MSS.

success of his preaching. Mr. Bunyan was to appear on a week-day in the pulpit of a church in a country village, in the county; and a great number of people was collected together to hear him. The Cambridge student riding by at the time enquired, what meant the concourse of people? He was told that one Bunyan, a *tinker*, was to preach there; in a sportive mood he committed his horse to the care of a boy, saying, "he was resolved to hear the *tinker* *prate*," and went into the church. His attention was fixed; he was affected and impressed; he came out serious and thoughtful, and much changed; and would, when he could gratify his taste, hear none but the *tinker* for a long time.* The learned Dr. Owen, the vice-chancellor of the university of Oxford, countenanced his ministerial labours, and attended his sermons. The intolerance of the government, in a few years, put a stop to this course of services. On the 12th of November, 1660, he was requested to preach at Gansel, near Harlington, in Bedfordshire; and there he was apprehended by virtue of a warrant granted by Francis Wingate, esq; a justice of peace, before whom he was taken, and then committed to Bedford goal. After an imprisonment of seven weeks he was tried on an indictment at Bedford quarter-sessions; charged with "having *devilishly* and *perniciously* abstained from coming to church to hear divine service; and with being a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the great *disturbance*

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 65.

“ and *distraction* of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our sovereign lord the king.” All, it has been justly observed, that John Bunyan had been guilty of, though it was alleged to be thus “ *devilish* and *pernicious*, “ and so wickedly calculated to *disturb* and *distract* “ the good people of England,” was merely worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and endeavouring to propagate his own religious opinions. But even the facts stated in this ridiculous indictment were not proved, no witnesses were produced against him : but some words which came from him in the course of a conversation with the justices, were taken for a conviction and recorded : he was sent back to prison, under this sentence, to lie there for three months : and if he did not then engage to hear divine service, and attend in the church, and desist from preaching, to be banished the realm ; and in case of not leaving the realm on an appointed day, or of returning to it without a special licence from the king, to be hanged.*

His wife, to whom, at the time of his commitment, he had been married almost two years,† on the following assizes addressed herself to the judges ; but the justices had prejudiced them, to the utmost they could, against him. Sir Matthew Hale who was one of them, and appeared to know nothing of his history indeed, had the matter come judicially

* Biographia Britannica, by Kippis and others, vol. iii. article *Bunyan*, page 12, note 1.

† She was his second wife.

before him, seemed desirous to afford him relief; and advised his wife to procure a writ of error: but Bunyan and his friends were either too poor, or too little acquainted with such matters, to take the necessary steps to obtain his enlargement. The sentence of banishment was never executed against him; but he was detained in prison from sessions to sessions, from assizes to assizes, without being brought before the judges, and obtaining permission to plead his cause, till his imprisonment lasted twelve years. He endured the evils of this long confinement with perfect resignation and patience; learnt to make long tagged thread-laces, and supported himself by it; and wrote many of his tracts, though his library is said to have consisted only of his Bible and the Book of Martyrs. His enlargement at last is ascribed to the compassion and interest of the worthy prelate Dr. Barlow bishop of Lincoln, and to the interference of Dr. Owen.* There was an existing law, which invested a bishop with the power to release a prisoner, situated as was Mr. Bunyan, if any two persons would join in a cautionary bond that he should conform in half a year. Dr. Owen readily consented, on being requested, to give his bond. The bishop, on application being made to him, declined availing himself of his episcopal prerogative; but as the law provided that, in case of a bishop's refusal, application should be made to the Lord Chancellor to issue out an order to take the cautionary bond and release the prisoner, the bishop proposed

* British Biography, vol. vi. p. 106.

this mode of proceeding as more safe for himself at that critical time, as he had many enemies, and promised a compliance with the order of the chancellor. This measure, though it was not so direct as the other, and was more expensive, was adopted, and Mr. Bunyan was released. In the last year of his imprisonment, 1671, on the death of Mr. Gifford, he had been unanimously chosen to succeed him in the pastoral office.

After his enlargement, he employed himself in preaching and writing; and made journies into various parts of the kingdom to visit pious persons of his own religious views, which visitations fixed on him the title of "Bishop Bunyan." When James II. published his declaration for the liberty of conscience in 1687, though he saw it proceeded not from kindness to protestant dissenters, and his piercing judgment anticipated the black cloud of slavery which the sunshine of transient liberty was intended to introduce, yet he thought it right to improve the present day; and by the contributions of his followers built a public meeting-house at Bedford, in which he constantly preached to large congregations. It was his constant practice also, after his liberty, to visit London once a year; where he preached in several places, particularly in Southwark, to numerous auditors, with great acceptance. At last he fell, not a victim to the malignant spirit of persecution, but a sacrifice, in the event, to the pacific kindness of his own heart. A young gentleman having fallen under the resentment of his father, requested

Mr. Bunyan's reconciliatory offices to make up the breach. He undertook and happily effected this benevolent office. On his return to London, from the journey which it occasioned, he was overtaken with excessive rains, and contracted a cold from being very wet, which brought on a violent fever, that in ten days put a period to his life at the house of Mr. Straddocks, a grocer, on Snow-hill, on the 12th of August, in the 60th year of his age. According to the description of his person and the delineation of his character, drawn by the continuator of his life, " he appeared in countenance to be
" of a stern and rough temper, but was in his con-
" versation mild and affable ; not given to loquacity
" or much discourse in company, unless some
" urgent occasion required it ; observing never to
" boast of himself or his parts, but rather seem low
" in his own eyes, and submitted himself to the
" judgment of others ; abhorring lying and swear-
" ing ; being just, in all that lay in his power, to his
" word ; not seeming to revenge injuries, loving to
" reconcile differences, and making friendship with
" all ; he had an excellent discernment of persons,
" being of good judgment and quick wit. As for
" his person, he was tall of stature ; strong boned,
" though not corpulent ; somewhat of a ruddy face,
" with sharp and sparkling eyes ; wearing his hair
" on his upper lip after the old British fashion ;
" his hair reddish, but in his latter days time had
" sprinkled it with grey ; his nose well set, but not
" declining or bending ; and his mouth moderately

“ large ; his forehead something high, and his habit
 “ always plain and modest.” §

“ When he arrived at the 60th year of his age,
 “ he had written books,” it has been observed,
 “ equal to the number of his years.” His works,
 which had been long printed in detached pieces on
 tobacco paper, were collected together and reprinted
 in 1736 and 1737, in 2 vols. folio; and have since been
 reprinted in a fairer edition, particularly in one impres-
 sion with a recommendation from the pen of Mr. Geo.
 Whitfield. The Pilgrim’s Progress had, in the
 year 1784, passed through upwards of 50 editions.

Bunyan, “ who had been mentioned,” says Mr.
 Granger, “ amongst the least and lowest of our
 “ writers, deserves a much higher rank than is com-
 “ monly imagined. His master-piece is his ‘ Pilgrim’s
 “ ‘ Progress,’ one of the most popular, and I may
 “ add, one of the most ingenious books in the
 “ English language.* It gives us a clear and distinct
 “ idea of Calvinistical divinity. The allegory is
 “ admirably carried on, and the characters are justly
 “ drawn and uniformly supported. The author’s
 “ original and poetic genius shines through the
 “ coarseness and vulgarity of his language, and inti-
 “ mates that if he had been a master of numbers he
 “ might have composed a poem worthy of Spenser
 “ himself. As this opinion may be deemed paradox-
 “ ical, I shall venture to name two persons of
 “ eminence of the same sentiments ; one, the late

§ Biographia Britannica, ut ante, note Z.

* This observation, Mr. Granger observes in the margin, is not
 to be extended to the second part.

“ Mr. Merrick, of Reading, who has been heard to
“ say in conversation, ‘ that his invention was like
“ that of Homer;’ the other, Dr. Roberts, fellow
“ of Eton college.”†

The mixture of the dramatic and narrative, enlivening the style, Lord Kaimes remarks, has rendered the “ Pilgrim’s Progress,” and “ Robinson Crusoe,” great favourites of the vulgar, and has been the cause of their having been translated into several European languages. Bunyan had such an extraordinary knack in amusing and parabolical compositions under the form of visions, that some thought there were communications made to him in *dreams*, and that he first really dreamt over the matter contained in his writings of this kind. This notion was not a little propagated by his picture prefixed to some of his treatises, in which he is represented in a sleeping posture. An anonymous author in 1729, speaking of the “ Pilgrim’s Progress,” remarked that “ it had infinitely outdone
“ The Tale of a Tub, which perhaps had not made
“ one convert to infidelity ; whereas the Pilgrim’s
“ Progress had converted many sinners to Christ.”*

Dr. Kippis, with great deference to the opinions of such judges as Mr. Merrick and Dr. Roberts, doubts whether Bunyan could ever have been capable of rising to a production worthy a Spenser. The poverty, not with regard to numbers only but to

† Granger’s History of England, vol. iii. p. 348, 8vo. ed. 1779.

* The above remarks are taken from Mr. Oldy’s MSS. See Biographia Britannica, ut ante, p. 13, note L.

fancy, visible in the specimens of his versification, justifies an apprehension, that with the best advantages of education he would scarcely have attained to complete poetical composition. “He had the
“invention, but not the other natural qualifications
“which are necessary to constitute a great poet.
“If his genius had intended him to be any thing
“more than a poet in prose, it would probably,
“like Shakespeare’s, have broken through every
“difficulty of birth and station.”

It may be added, that a learned bishop,† whose practical writings glow with a devotional spirit, and whose commentaries are still in high estimation, published also an allegorical work, entitled “The Pilgrim;” but not with a success or reputation that could in any degree rival Bunyan’s performance. The writer of this recollects that at a classical lesson, when he was at St. Paul’s school, Mr. Allen, the learned editor of Demosthenes, passed high encomiums on the latter work, as greatly superior in point of invention to the former, which has now sunk into oblivion.

This article, it may be apprehended, has been carried to a length beyond the proportion of room it should occupy in a work not professedly biographical; but the singularity of the character will be admitted as an apology.‡

In the list of those who sustained great trials in a conscientious adherence to their religious profession,

† Bishop Patrick.

‡ Biographia Britannica; Granger’s History of England; British Biography, as before; and Crosby, vol. iii, p. 63—75.

was Mr. *Henry Forty*, in his early years a member of Mr. *Jesley's* congregation, and afterwards pastor of the church at Abingdon. His own parents, as well as many other persons, received a pious determination of mind from his preaching. He lay twelve years, for the testimony of a good conscience, in prison at Exeter ; and died in the 67th year of his age, in 1692, with the character of a man of great piety and unblameable manners. Mr. *Benj. Keach* preached his funeral sermon.

The short history of the next person, Mr. *Isaac Lamb*, was marked with many peculiar circumstances. He was a native of Colchester, where he was born in 1650, and for some time attended his father in Cromwell's army. From his youth he discovered an affectionate attachment to piety, and took great delight in the perusal of the scriptures. His progress in that study surpassed what could be expected from his years. The gravity of his aspect and the seriousness of his deportment gave him so manly and dignified an appearance, that at the age of 16 he was made chaplain of the *Constant Warwick*, a man of war in *Oliver's* navy. He often preached before Admiral *Blake*; and once in the presence of him, Admiral *Penn*, and another naval officer of the same rank. He delivered serious, interesting thoughts in an agreeable manner. At one time six of the ship's crew were baptized by him in an arm of the sea. After having been on different occasions, not fewer than twenty times, on the French or Spanish shores, and at other places, he returned

from Holland in 1660 in the same fleet which brought over Charles II. His principles of non-conformity soon exposed him to privations and sufferings. He was offered a benefice of an 100*l.* per annum; which, as he could not, consistently with his sentiments, sprinkle the children of the parish, he declined to accept. It was proposed to him to do this part of his parochial duty by another; but it was repugnant to his sense of religious simplicity and integrity to engage a substitute to perform a service, which in his view was a misapplication of a christian institution. He therefore refused the living. It heightened the merit of this sacrifice to the delicacy of principle, that he lost by his refusal 200*l.* due on the living, and ready to be paid to the next incumbent. Being fixed by this determination among the dissenters, he became pastor of a congregation in East-Smithfield. It greatly increased under his popular strain of preaching; and removed to a new building, erected for its accommodation, in Virginia-street, Ratcliffe highway; where the auditory was numerous, and the communicants amounted at times to three hundred. Their worship was often disturbed by officers and soldiers in King Charles' reign. Once an officer with his military subalterns came and commanded him to be silent. He answered in the words of the apostle, "Whether it be right
" in the sight of God to hearken unto you more
" than unto God, judge ye." Upon which the officer with his soldiers went off. At another time Sir William Smith, Mr. Bury, Mr. Brown, and four

other justices, came in their coaches, with a mob, to break the windows and to tear up the pews and pulpit of the meeting-house, as they had before done at the meeting-house of Mr. Hercules Collins, in the neighbourhood. But Mr. Lamb, having previously received notice of their intention, had, by the advice of a friend, removed all the furniture of the place, except a few loose forms; so that they were disappointed in their purpose; on which one of the justices said, that his name ought to have been *Fox*, and not *Lamb*. He died on the 20th of August 1691. He was a man of sweet temper and exemplary conversation; and great usefulness marked his course. §

One of the most distinguished characters amongst the General Baptists of the times was Mr. *Thomas Grantham*, descended from a reduced branch of an antient family of rank and opulence in Lincolnshire. He was born, in the year 1634, in the village of Halton, near Spilsby; and the house in which he drew his first breath, is still shewn to those who venerate his memory. As his parents were in low circumstances, he was brought up a taylor; but he afterwards directed his attention to agriculture, and occupied a farm. From an early period of his life his mind received a serious and religious tincture; and he was baptized, on the profession of his faith in the gospel, about the age of nineteen, and joined the church at Boston. In the year 1656, when he was 22 years of age, he was chosen pastor of a

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 190—193.

church in the South-Marsh parts of the county, consisting then only of four persons. He had for several years associated with them, and been active in assisting their religious improvement by procuring ministers to preach to them publicly, or exercising his own gifts for prayer and instruction among them privately. This small society was a branch of a church which arose in 1644, formed at first on the principle of rejecting in the administration of baptism, while they retained the practice of sprinkling, the cross and sponsors. Some of them afterwards, as they pursued their religious enquiries, saw reasons to adopt the practice of immersion on a profession of faith. This change in the sentiments of some did not meet with the concurrence of all : disagreements arose, which terminated in a disunion in 1651. The few who embraced the principles of the baptists, after Mr. Grantham's connection with them, as a pastor, soon increased in numbers. His zeal and energy animated the rest. As they had an accession of new members, there arose among them several who became acceptable and useful ministers. They drew the attention of their neighbours on themselves, and were exposed to the malignity of enemies. Mr. Grantham and several others were summoned before the magistrates ; who, as the accusations alleged against them had no foundation but in lies and forged stories, soon perceived their innocence, and they were set at liberty, and went on cheerfully, though often insulted by the mob and opposed by the clergy. Even during the Protectorate, or inter-

regnum, their preachers were interrupted in their discourses ; and sometimes dragged out of doors, and pelted and stoned with barbarous violence. All this abuse they bore with patience and meekness. Their meetings were held first, at Halton and other places, in private houses ; at length they obtained a grant of Northholm chapel, near Croft, and not far from Waynfleet. Here they remained some years, and had many accessions of members to their communion. Among others, Mr. John Watts, a person of eminence and reputation in those parts, who had been educated for the ministry at the university ; but not being able, from a principle of conscience, to conform to the rites and practices of the national church, he had obtained no dignity or preferment. He became, after he had joined himself to Mr. Grantham and his friends, the worthy pastor of a baptist church gathered by his ministry, and which held their assemblies for divine worship in his own house.

Mr. Grantham is supposed to have drawn up the "Narrative and Complaint," stating the sufferings of the Baptists, which accompanied the "Brief Confession of Faith," and "Petition," presented to the king, Charles II, on the 26th of July, 1660.* About 1662 he was apprehended, carried before a magistrate, and bound over to the assizes to be holden for the county of Lincoln. At the same time many

* Universal Theological Magazine, vol. iii. p. 8.—N. B. The Brief Confession is given by Crosby, vol. ii. Appendix, No. iv. ; and in the preceding Miscellany, p. 9, 10 ; and No. xiv. p. 57—59.

of the baptists were harassed with prosecutions for absence from the established church, and with the exaction of penalties of 20l. per month. The consequence of the proceedings against Mr. Grantham was an imprisonment for fifteen months. Obloquy and insult were added to the evils of confinement. Several clergymen who visited him upbraided him with being a jesuit ; and a rumour was spread that he was a papist. To confute this calumny and counteract the impressions which it made, he published a controversy which he maintained with a Roman Catholic, and entitled it, “ The Baptist against the “ Papist.” By this prudent conduct he silenced the report. During his imprisonment he published a treatise entitled, “ The Prisoner against the Prelate ; “ or, a Dialogue between the Common Gaol of “ Lincoln and the Cathedral :” and another work under the title of “ Christianismus Primitivus.” In these publications, as the designed brevity of “ The “ Brief Confession” had occasioned some ambiguity, he treated the subject more explicitly and fully. When we consider the prevailing sentiments of that age concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, it is a singular circumstance that the first article in this confession expresses the doctrine of the Unity of God with a scriptural simplicity, that is in obvious contrast to the received standards,—the Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, and the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. This may justly excite our surprize, while it recommends itself to our approbation. It runs thus, “ We believe, and are very

“ confident, that there is but ONE God, the *Father*,
“ of whom are all things from everlasting to ever-
“ lasting, glorious and unwordable in all his
“ attributes :” 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Isa. xl. 28. At the
assizes, in the spring of 1663, no one appearing and
no crime being alleged against them, Mr. Grantham
and his virtuous fellow sufferers, who had been
committed with him, were discharged, and returned
to the churches to which they belonged, who re-
ceived them with no small joy.

Mr. Grantham suffered a second imprisonment
under the operation of the Conventicle Act, which
was first passed for seven years in 1663, and was
revived at the expiration of that term with addi-
tional clauses of heightened severity in 1670 : under
the authority of this Act soldiers were empowered to
disarm those that dissented from the national esta-
blishment. Though no arms were found in the
possession of the baptists, yet their houses were rifled,
their goods carried off, and they themselves forced
away from their wives and families, without knowing
whither they were to be driven, or whether they
should be prosecuted by law, or fall a sacrifice to
military force. They were dragged from town to
town, and compelled to run like lacqueys by the
sides of the soldiers’ horses. Mr. Grantham, Mr.
John Gree, and Mr. John Green, with several
others, were thus the victims of armed insolence and
violence. Mr. Grantham and his friends were
lodged, tied up during the whole night, at an inn,
in a room not fit for entertainment : their situation

drove sleep from their eyes; nor would the soldiers take any rest, but sat up near them, and with rioting and revellings, oaths and curses, annoyed and shocked these pious prisoners. On the morning they were conducted to Louth, put into the house of correction, and afterwards brought before the committee. At this tribunal, instead of well-supported charges against them, insidious questions were put, to draw from them some ground of accusation; and they were asked to pledge themselves on oath to conformity. Though the times afforded many examples of those who had been terrified into a dereliction of their principles, these good men, and the baptists in general, remained firm and unshaken in their religious profession. Mr. Grantham and his two fellow sufferers were by strict command sent to gaol, where they lay for half a year. During their imprisonment the assizes came on, but their enemies prevented their cause from being heard. They were afterwards, at the quarter-sessions, brought before the justices; but the bench refused to enter into the case, or proceed against them. Upon this the Sheriff pleaded, that as he had produced them in open court, he was free from his charge; and so they were set at liberty, but without any compensation for their unjust imprisonment and attendant sufferings.

Mr. Grantham, soon after his liberation, was harassed under a different and unsanctioned mode of persecuting malignity. He was prosecuted on action of 100l. for with force of arms beating and uncivilly treating the wife of a certain person;

merely on the ground of his having baptized her. But to the shame of his prosecutors, the cause which threatened his ruin was thrown out of court at the next assizes as a malicious prosecution.

“ The malice and violence of their enemies against
“ Mr. Grantham and his adherents often carried
“ them to the greatest and most shocking lengths.
“ Defamation and lying accusations were among
“ their most common weapons. The worst of men
“ appearing as *informers*; the worst of *magistrates*
“ abetting and encouraging them; and the worst
“ of priests, who first began to blow the fire, now
“ seeing how it spread, clapping their hands, and
“ hallooing them on to this evil work.”* In vindication of themselves and their principles against this malicious treatment, Mr. Grantham drew up a small piece, which was never published, entitled, “ The Baptist’s Complaint against the persecuting Priest, &c.” This tract was a remonstrance against the persecuting spirit, to which this denomination of christians, notwithstanding their friendly deportment and faithful endeavours to maintain peace and brotherly concord, had been exposed for more than thirty years; which stirred up persons in authority to harass them by imprisonment and seizure of their goods; and which expressed itself in irreligious abuse and invectives even from the pulpit, where they were stigmatized as “ heretics,” and “ damned fanatics.” This malicious treatment was provoked only by their “ dissent from the Church

* Universal Theological Magazine, ut ante, p. 63.

“ of England in some practices, which the most
“ learned confessed had neither *precept* nor *precedent*
“ in the word.” It was more criminal in the clergy
to manifest this conduct towards baptists, because
they had never withheld from them their dues ; but
had paid them their demands as punctually as any
others, and, as they alleged, probably from better
principles. “ For we consider,” they pleaded, “ that
“ when we either hire or purchase land, the *tenth*
“ is excepted, and is therefore not ours. But yet it
“ is also to be considered, that tithes were not given
“ to maintain men in drunkenness, lording over, per-
“ secuting, and ruining such as fear God, merely
“ because they dissent from them in the things
“ aforesaid; yet thus goes the business in these
“ days ; by which unreasonable practices they out-
“ do the false prophets who were of old, for they
“ prepared war against those that did not put into
“ their mouths, but these devour those that labour
“ to maintain them.” A concluding sentiment in
this “ Complaint” deserves, for its justness and force,
to be repeated. “ We believe,” observes Mr.
Grantham in the name of his fellow sufferers, “ and
“ are sure, that to persecute is no mark of the true
“ church, but to suffer persecution is so ; and that
“ religion is not worth professing in time of peace,
“ which is not worth owning in the time of the
“ greatest trouble.”*

Mr. Grantham, after this recent discharge from
gaol, again suffered imprisonment several times ; and

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 84—88.

continued to be very sorely harassed and oppressed during the remainder of that infamous reign. About the end of it, or soon after James II. succeeded to the throne, he removed from Lincolnshire and settled in the city of Norwich. This change of his residence did not abate or diminish his activity and labours. He was still firm to the cause for which he had so long and severely suffered, and was unwearied in his exertions to promote it. He soon raised and formed a church, in that city, on the principles of the general baptists, which met at the *White Friars' yard*, and which still exists.† He directed his attention, with similar success, to the populous town of Yarmouth. In the year 1688, or 1689, he visited, with the same lau-

† A grandson of Mr. Grantham, Grantham Killingworth, esq; who died about the year 1779, left a considerable part of his property for the support of the minister at the *White Friars' yard*. He was a leading character among the baptists, and the author of various theological tracts, written with ability and judgment. He was particularly on the alert to seize the opportunities afforded by any controversy of his times, to graft on it arguments in defence of his own views on the nature and subjects of baptism. When the "Sermons against Popery" were preached at *Salter's Hall*, he published a tract, entitled "A Supplement to the Sermons lately preached at *Salter's Hall* against Popery; with a view to shew that, on the reasonings of the preachers, *infant sprinkling* was another *great corruption* of the Christian religion." This pamphlet came to a fifth edition, in which other points, viz. Mr. Emlyn's Previous Question, &c. were discussed. On occasion of the controversy with the author of "Christianity not founded on Argument," Mr. Killingworth published "Remarks on the several Answers to it;" in which his aim was to turn the reasonings of the authors, who were pædobaptists, against themselves. See Bulkley's notes on the Bible, vol. iii. Life, p. 15, 16, note.

dable views, the town of Lynn-Regis, at the other extremity of the county. He first preached in the town-hall to a numerous and attentive auditory. The prospect was so favourable, that it encouraged a friend, Mr. James Marham, at whose house he was entertained, to procure and fit up a convenient place of worship; a church was gathered; and Mr. Marham was the first pastor of it. Though the place was duly registered according to the directions and authority of the Act of Toleration, which passed just as the building was completed, yet the minister and hearers were harassed by a prosecution, on the Conventicle Act, in 1691.† The Revolution and the Act of Toleration, though great blessings to the nation, did not immediately effect a change in the views and temper of the mass of the people. It required time for the violence of a persecuting spirit to subside, and for just sentiments on religious liberty to take possession of the public mind, and spread their influence to any considerable extent. The malignity of old prejudices, against the baptists in particular, was softened, in many places at least, very slowly and partially. Mr. Grantham continued to feel its effects till the time of his death. The envenomed tongue of scandal in particular employed itself in vile calumnies and charges of gross immoralities. Among those who traduced his character were Mr. Toathby, who had been a magistrate, and took his rank in society as a gentleman and a clergyman; and Mr. John Willer, the rector of

† Universal Theological Magazine, ut ante, p. 111—112.

Tattershall in Lincolnshire. The latter had the effrontery and baseness to declare, in writing under his own signature, “that he saw Mr. Grantham “stand in the pillory two hours, at Louth, for “stealing sheep and hurdles; and that he saw him “hold up his hand at the bar.” This falsehood was circulated both at Norwich and Yarmouth; and Mr. Grantham was induced to refer the matter to Thomas Blofield, esq; mayor of Norwich. The accuser, on being brought before this magistrate, confessed the absolute falsehood of the charge which he had promulgated and signed; and with cryings, and tears, and wringing of his hands, over and over implored Mr. Grantham’s forgiveness. The mayor, on Mr. Grantham’s readily forgiving him, commanded, with expressions of his strong abhorrence of the rector’s conduct, a record of the confession to be made out by the clerk, and to be signed and sealed by the calumniating clergyman:* who after this was done, as he had no money, would have been committed to prison for charges, had not Mr. Grantham, on the true christian principle of rendering good for evil, given the officer of the court ten shillings to set his enemy at liberty.

Mr. Grantham died on the 17th of January, 1692, at the age of 58. Indecencies were threatened to his corpse, but they were happily prevented. Soon after his decease, a paper was published and signed by eight friends, containing his dying words,

* A copy of the Confession may be seen in Crosby, vol. iii. p. 263.

addressed to them within two minutes of his death, mostly in the language of scripture ; expressive of his sense of his approaching end ; of the testimony of his conscience as to the integrity of his conduct, and of the disinterested purity of his motives in preaching the gospel ; of his affection to his friends, leaving with them his last counsels in a strain of apostolic admonitions, casting his eyes back on his sufferings in being made a scoff and a gazing-stock to many people, cordially forgiving his enemies, and soliciting the prayers of his friends for their forgiveness ; taking a final leave of them with affection, devotion, and sacred hope, “ Friends,” he began, “ I am in a very weak condition, and as this is the
“ sabbath with me, it will be the everlasting sab-
“ bath ; for now I am going off the stage of this
“ world.” He concluded thus : “ to be short, I
“ must leave you. Do not grieve or mourn for me ;
“ though I die, yet I shall rise to glory, where I
“ desire we may all meet and see one another’s face
“ at the last day, knowing one another, and rejoicing
“ in glory ; for I have conquered the infernal
“ enemy by this faith, and have made the way plain
“ and easy to me. And now I commit you to the
“ grace of our Lord Jesus Christ : and the love of
“ God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be
“ with you all. Amen.”*

Mr. Grantham, besides the treatises already mentioned, wrote “ The Pædobaptists’ Apology for the
“ baptized churches.” The design of the tract

* Universal Theological Magazine, ut ante, p. 115, 116.

was to shew, by quotations from the writings of pædobaptists, that the practice of the baptists, as to the mode and subject of baptism, was most antient and apostolical; and that infant baptism was a novelty. The deductions from these premises were, that the sufferings inflicted on the baptists were no less a glory to them than a shame to their persecutors.*

Report has represented Mr. Grantham as acquainted with eight or nine languages. This is most probably an exaggerated account of his attainments. His grandson, Mr. Grantham Killingworth, it appears, spoke of him as able to write the Latin with considerable ease and correctness. His writings afford proofs of his having acquired some proficiency in the learned languages: his polemical publications were thought to do credit to his abilities, and to his acuteness in the art of reasoning: though he himself, in the preface to “a Defence of the Christian Religion against human Invention and pretended Revelations, dated from the Castle of Lincoln, 10th Jan. 1663;” apologized for the defects which might be discovered in his language and method, by pleading that “he got his bread by the labour of his hands, and had never saluted the schools to gain the knowledge of their arts.” That he possessed no small share of literary attainments, of address, and of weight of character, is reasonably inferred, from his being frequently delegated to take an active and leading part in the

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 90.

concerns of the general baptists of that day, even in their applications to the throne ; when there was not a want of men of real learning, who had been educated at the university.

Mr. James Marham, whose name occurs in the preceding Memoir, merits more particular notice, as a conspicuous and distinguished person amongst the baptists in Lincolnshire and Norfolk. The time and place of his nativity are not ascertained. He seems to have commenced his appearance on the stage of public life at Holbeach in Lincolnshire, in 1681 or 1682. He was the first of that class of dissenters in that place; and soon after his settlement in it, assemblies for religious worship were held in his house ; the original preachers were Mr. Samuel Phillips, and Mr. William Rix; the first was pastor of the church in Deadman's-lane in Wisbeach. In the reign of King James he was settled in Wapool-bell, a town in Norfolk, where the people having never heard of the name of baptists, called him “ an outlandish professor.” Here he laid the foundation of a church of the baptist denomination, which now exists; and from which originated another church, formed in Wisbeach. On the death of his wife, Mr. Marham removed to Lynn; in this town, also, though on his settlement in it there was not another baptist there, he hired and furnished a place for religious worship, and engaged the services of Mr. Grantham, and Mr. Long, a messenger from the baptist churches in London, whom he entertained at his own house and table without any pecuniary

compensation for some months ; and by these means raised a church, of which he afterwards became himself the pastor.

The conspicuous activity and zeal of this excellent man exposed him to various sufferings. About three years before the death of Charles II. he was harassed by prosecutions from court to court, and carried from one justice to another, for four weeks ; and though by his vigorous interference he procured the liberation of his ministers, Mr. Rix and Mr. Phillips, he himself suffered imprisonment ; and a fine of several score pounds was levied on him, for having disturbed and broken the uniformity of the religious profession of the town. After this his goods were distrained. When he had lived three weeks at Wapool-bell, he was commanded by the officers of the town to frequent the parish church, or to appear before the justice and parson of the parish Mr. Harbe. He complied with the latter requisition, and underwent an examination of four hours in the presence of several gentlemen. This did not terminate to the satisfaction of the clerical examiner, and a time for another investigation was fixed ; but on the Proclamation for liberty of conscience, this enquiry was declined. At Lynn, new troubles awaited him. In July 1691, he with others, as before noticed, were prosecuted on the Conventicle Act, though the place of meeting had been registered according to the Act of Parliament, and their goods were seized by a levy granted against him. He petitioned the judge Sir E— N—, at Nor-

wich in September following, and was forced to prefer the same complaint to some of the great council at the sessions of Parliament. After Parliament had risen, he was prosecuted on the same grounds, and involved in troubles that threatened his ruin. In the following October, the informers against him, affecting great remorse, obtained from him a discharge from their false information, by entering into bonds of an amicable tenor; but they were base and daring enough after this actually to seize his goods on the former levy. On this he was advised to sue the bonds; and the baptists at London were solicited to unite in his support with all possible liberality and energy. It is to be regretted that no documents offer themselves to throw light on the termination of this vexatious suit, and further to elucidate the history and character of this virtuous and conscientious sufferer; to whose piety, zeal, and benevolence this imperfect detail affords pleasing and affecting testimonies.*

Another character among the baptists of those times, distinguished by some peculiar circumstances, was *Mr. Edward Morecock*, a man of eminence, of great zeal and firmness, and much courted on King James's accession. He was born in January 1626; and died in August 1693. He was originally in the naval service; and in the Protectorate was captain of a man of war, when he was shot in an

* "A brief Relation of the remarkable Services and Troubles that went before the present Trouble of our brother James Marham;" quoted in *Universal Theol. Mag.* ut ante, p. 112, &c. note,

engagement through the body with a musquet ball. He made a handsome provision for a family of nearly twenty children, by his skill in fishing up shipwrecks; especially by his recovering, after the Dutch war in 1672, ships sunk in the river Medway, which had come so close to Chatham as to throw many of their shot into the town, one of which was found in Captain Morecock's garden. After this he engaged in the pastoral care of a church in that place; and so entirely devoted himself to its duties, that he declined very advantageous offers made to him, if he would undertake to recover wrecks at sea. His unblameable manners and obliging deportment gained him the esteem and affection of the gentlemen in the neighbourhood, insomuch that when any warrant was issued for seizing his person,—as he was harassed by frequent warrants against his body and goods, towards the end of King Charles the II'd's reign,—one of the justices would privately send his servant to apprise him of it before the officers could execute it. On receiving the intelligence, he usually retired to the house of one of his daughters in Essex. He was, however, fined with monthly penalties for non-attendance at the parish church, till he was exchequered to the amount of 800*l*. His house was often plundered, and his goods were seized and carried off. To secure himself from these ruinous depredations, on the ground of his nonconformity, he made his fortune over to an intimate friend; who, acting on the principles of justice and honour, restored it when the danger was past. One *Hinton*, an informer

against him, often threatened that he would have him cast into prison, and possess himself of his furniture; which he promised to give to a lewd woman who attended him. But Mr. Morecock, through a good Providence, always escaped imprisonment, while many of his brethren suffered by it. On visiting some of them once in Rochester gaol, he saw this *Hinton* confined in it; upon which he accosted him, “I see, friend, you have got hither
“before me.” This man afterwards died miserably, the flesh rotting from his bones. Lord Roper, a Roman Catholic, on the accession of James II. offered Mr. Morecock any post that he would accept; but he absolutely refused any commission under that king, assigning to his friends as a reason for his refusal, “that the favours offered by him
“to dissenters were designed only to draw them
“into a snare;” a reason which did credit to his sagacity, judgment, and disinterested principles. His firmness of conduct was at one time the occasion of a design against his life. Two witnesses were suborned to swear that he had been an officer in Monmouth’s army; but by unexceptionable evidence he proved that he was in another place at the time that he was charged with being in the army.*

Mr. John Miller, a native of Hinton-Marton, in the county of Dorset, descended from parents who were in affluent circumstances; a man of great piety, worth, and usefulness; deserves to be mentioned with respect. He was educated by a Presby-

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 109—112.

terian minister ; but a studious and diligent enquiry in after life led him to embrace the opinions of the baptists, and he was pastor of a congregation of this denomination at Minchinton, in the county in which he drew his first breath. He died on the 14th of May 1694. His active labours as a preacher were not limited to his own congregation ; he travelled from place to place, disseminating the principles of religion, and planting several churches in agreement with his ideas of christian truth. His non-conformity and opinions exposed him to severe sufferings : he lay ten years in prison, and very narrowly escaped a præmunire. In the year preceding the death of Charles II. he was harassed by vexatious proceedings, and greatly injured in his property by extortions. A distress was first taken on his goods on the Three Week Act : then he was apprehended and cast into prison at Dorchester ; at the summer assizes he was indicted for eleven months non-conforming ; and a neighbouring justice, to supply the deficiency of evidence against him, swore to the indictment : and though he pleaded that he had, contrary to the laws of England, suffered already in two courts for that offence, he was fined 220*l*. At Michaelmas, possession was taken of his assets by the bailiffs under the warrant of the under-sheriff, who seized and wasted between 4 and 500*l*. : and his eldest son was obliged to flee, in consequence of a warrant granted against him for taking an account of the goods that were sold. He petitioned the King for redress ; not to procure the restoration of his

goods, but only to secure the corn that was left from further depredation: he obtained, however, no other relief than what was implied in this imperious and insulting language, "I have nothing to say to you; you must go home and conform." The virtuous sufferer went home, but not to sacrifice principle by conformity: he sold his estate, retired to a solitary place, rented a small farm, and spent his remaining days in quiet. There was one occurrence in the life of Mr. Miller, which indicates that though he was the mark of persecuting malignity, his talents and character commanded respect; and, in such times, it was peculiarly honourable to the clergymen who were parties in it. This was a disputation, after liberty of conscience was granted, held with Dr. Beach and four other ministers of the established church, the time and place having been first published in three market-towns. The subjects of disputation were the consonance of their baptism, church, and ministry with the scriptures; and the charges of schism against Mr. Miller and his adherents. The questions concerning baptism came first under discussion. The clerical gentlemen were so impressed with Mr. Miller's arguments, that no reply was made, except that Dr. Beach ingenuously confessed that the point was difficult; and they waved entering into the other questions. On withdrawing to another house they sent for their opponent, received him with politeness and respect, apologized for having troubled him, and assured him that they would never dispute the

point with the baptists again ; and thus they separated with expressions of good-will and friendship.*

With the preceding names of those who, by their abilities, zeal, and characters, did credit to the denomination of dissenters of which we are speaking, may be enrolled *Mr. George Hammon*, pastor of a congregation at Biddenden in the county of Kent, the author of several publications suitable to the theological controversies and religious taste of the age. He was active in vindicating what appeared the truth to his own mind on all occasions, eminent for his ministerial exertions, and marked by the persecutions which he suffered. He died at Haselden's Wood, in the parish of Cranbrook. In connection with him may be mentioned *Mr. Richard Hobbs*, pastor of a congregation at Dover : distinguished by his piety and worth, and by his sufferings for religion. His seriousness and piety spoke so strongly in his favour, that when he was a prisoner in Dover, he was now and then allowed to go from his prison. In his confinement he addressed a letter to Dr. Hind, proposing for solution, in a modest and candid manner, two queries grounded on the scriptures. One was, whether the baptism practised in the church was not at variance with the directions of the scriptures, in the administrator, subject, and administration ? The other was, whether the church, by *forcing* all into it as communicants, however sinful and impious, did not pervert the gospel, overthrow the way of the new covenant,

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 121—124.

and give ground for pious and conscientious men to question the divine authority of its worship? Dr. Hind, instead of replying to these queries, instigated the magistrates to deprive him of the indulgence which he had received, and to enjoin an unrelaxed confinement. "These proceedings," Mr. Hobbs observed, "bore a great likeness to those beyond the seas, at Rome; where, if any do but question the truth of their worship, it is an hundred to one if they have not the Inquisition for their pains. Doubtless such kind of proceedings do sound more like the Pope's anathemas, than in the least favour of a protestant spirit."*

It is a just tribute of respect to integrity and fortitude to mention the names of others who were great sufferers for nonconformity. Mr. Tidmarsh, a baptist minister at Oxford, a man greatly esteemed; Mr. John Amory, a man of good literary attainments, of Wrington, in Somersetshire; Mr. Thomas Burges, pastor of a church at Taunton; Mr. James Hind, of Langport, and minister at Kinsbury; Mr. William Richards, who preached at Draycott; Mr. Peter Coles, of Downton, near Sarum; Mr. Walter Penn, pastor of a church in Sarum; Mr. John Kingman, of Burford, near that city; Mr. John Sanger, a schoolmaster and minister at Downton; Mr. Roger Applin, of Ellerton, and pastor of a congregation at Whitechurch; Mr. John Tredwell, a serious and useful preacher, and a man of unblemished manners; Mr. Francis Stanley, of

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 103, 104.

Northamptonshire, noted for his piety and zeal; Mr. John Grauden, of Cocket, near Towcester; Mr. John Stanton, of Bliffworth; Mr. Stephen Curtis, a native of Harringworth, in Northamptonshire, and a very useful minister in that place; Mr. Joseph Slater, Mr. William Stanger, and Mr. Robt. Bringham, who fled from the country to escape imprisonment; Mr. Benjamin Morley, of Ramsthorp; Mr. John reas, of East-Haddon; Mr. William Smith, Mr. William Blisse, of Welston; Mr. John Gilby, of Long-Bugby, in Northamptonshire; suffered imprisonment, and were despoiled of their goods by distresses, or almost ruined by heavy fines and charges. Mr. James Wilmot, a minister at Hooknorton, Oxfordshire, besides being confined twice in the prison of Oxford, and sustaining losses by distresses and fines; when he was released from the gaol in Whitney, was excommunicated, and was obliged to abscond, in order to escape the writs which were issued out against him. In some instances the sufferings of these conscientious professors were aggravated by the fraudulent practices of their persecutors, who seized their goods under false warrants. This art was practised, in November 1682, against Mr. Samuel Taverner, who was born at Romford in Essex in July 1621. He was originally an officer in the army; afterwards governor of Deal Castle. He embraced the principles of the baptists, on being led to entertain their views by his conversation with Dr. Prescott, pastor of the church at Dover; and was baptised at Sandwich, 13th April 1663. He was

ordained elder of the church at Dover on 13th October 1681. He suffered much for adherence to his religious profession ; and died on the 4th August 1696, in the 75th year of his age, having obtained celebrity for piety and usefulness. The severity of the jailor, at times, denied the imprisoned the consolation of any act of social devotion among themselves ; at Oxford they were not permitted to pray together ; and even the usual expression of piety at their meals was interrupted by the entrance of the jailor in a rage, and by his taunting enquiry, “ What are you preaching over your meal ? ”

The history of these pious sufferers affords examples of the death of persecutors, which were so circumstanced as to mark a great depravity of character, and the base principles by which the men were actuated ; though it belong not to men, who are incompetent judges of the ways of Providence, decidedly to pronounce them divine judgments. Mr. Richard Farmer, minister at Kibley in Leicestershire, an hard student, and a very affecting preacher, by a warrant to seize his goods, lost in one year 120l. One of the informers against him, who boasted on a Christmas, at Trinkley market, of his proceedings against him, and declared exultingly that before Candlemas he should by informations make a good portion for his daughter, was thrown from his horse as he was riding home over a boggy place, where there was a little brook, and drowned in a quantity of water not deep enough to cover his body. Another informer, soon after he had sworn against

Mr. Farmer, died of a swollen tongue, without being suspected of having taken a false oath.*

If the characters which have passed under our review be not transmitted down to our times as having enlarged the bounds of science, nor as having distinguished themselves in the walks of criticism or philosophy; yet by their religious integrity, and by their zeal and fortitude, they gained the respect of the sect to which they conscientiously adhered, and the interests of which they were active in promoting. In the history of that sect, though it be a circumscribed theatre of fame, they have a claim to honourable mention. The hardships, losses, and sufferings, which they experienced in the cause that they espoused, hold forth instructive warnings to future times of the malignity of an intolerant and persecuting spirit among protestants; and shew us with what a slow progress, and partial operation of better principles, that spirit had declined among the mass of those who were dissidents from the church of Rome, though an hundred and fifty years had elapsed since the separation of England from that ecclesiastical tyranny.

§. 4. *Of the Quakers.*

THIS community of Christians had, during the period preceding the Revolution, smarted under the severest strokes of the rod of persecution. When, after this event, the Act of Toleration was

* Crosby, vol. iii. p. 112, 118, 124—128.

passed, with a design, at once politic and generous, to unite the protestants of the different denominations in an attachment to the new government, against the adherents to popery and the excluded royal race ; yet some were adverse to the extension of its benefits, so as to include the Quakers under its propitious influence. “ The quakers,” it was declared in the House, “ were no Christians.” Some members of this society, who attended the Parliament to watch the progress of the bill, and to use their endeavours that it might pass in such terms as might yield an effectual relief to their own body, found it clogged with a confession, as a test upon the dissenters, which carried on its face a design to exclude them : and they apprehended that it was inserted on the presumption that they disbelieved the Trinity and denied the Scriptures, and would therefore scruple to accede to it. If the principle on which this clause was formed, betrayed ignorance of the sentiments of the quakers, it must be owned to have reflected credit on their sincerity and fortitude ; implying a persuasion that they would not, through fear of suffering, be betrayed into prevarication and falsehood.

The article proposed to be inserted in the bill was this : “ I A. B. do profess faith in God the Father, “ and in Jesus Christ his eternal Son, the true God, “ and in the Holy Spirit, coequal with the Father and “ his Son, one God blessed for ever : And do acknow- “ ledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Tes- “ tament to be the revealed will and word of God.” The Friends who attended the Parliament objected,

on several grounds, to this confession. One was this: that the phrase *the word of God*, being applied to the books or writings of the Old and New Testament, had a sense given it different from that in which the scriptures themselves use it, viz. “the word that
“ was from the beginning, that was with God, and
“ that was GOD.” A more enlarged principle of objection to it was, that they did not esteem themselves obliged to receive for doctrine the invented terms or commandments of men ; though they were ready to testify their faith in the Trinity, and in the scriptures, according to scripture testimony. At the advice of Sir Thomas Clarges and other Members of the House, who were friendly to them, they proposed a profession drawn up in the following terms : “ I A. B. profess faith in God the Father,
“ and in Jesus Christ his eternal Son, the true God,
“ and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed for ever:
“ And do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the
“ Old and New Testament to be given by divine
“ inspiration.” It may escape the penetration of some to discern any material difference between these two formularies of faith, - or to exculpate the latter, any more than the proposed form, from the imputation of being exhibited in the invented terms or commandments of men. But it was a form of their own drawing up, and satisfied the scruples of their minds: Sir Thomas Clarges presented it to the House; and moved, in a Committee of the whole House, that this profession of faith should be admitted and substituted for the former. The mem-

bers of the Society of Friends who were in waiting, viz. Mr. George Whitehead, Mr. John Vaughton, Mr. Wm. Mead, and Mr. John Osgood, were called in and examined. Their answers gave the House such satisfaction as to their belief in those points comprehended in the formulary, as secured the end of their attendance, and obtained the relief which they solicited; for their proposed profession was incorporated into the Act of Toleration: Whereas it enjoined and required from the ministers and preachers, from all in holy orders, or pretended holy orders, among the other denominations of dissenters, an approbation of and subscription to the thirty-nine articles, except the 34th, 35th, and 36th, and a clause in the 20th; and, in indulgence to those who scruple the baptizing of infants, that part of the 27th article, which teaches infant baptism.

In another instance this Act of Toleration was modelled with a peculiar and tender regard to the scrupulosity of the Society of Friends. They, it is well known, entertain a conscientious scruple against taking any oath: in the room, therefore, of the oaths mentioned in the Act, and required of other dissenters, as a condition of their title to the benefit of it, the people called Quakers were allowed, as the term of their claim to the advantages of it, to subscribe the following declaration only, viz.

“ I A. B. do sincerely promise and solemnly
“ declare, before God and the world, that I will be
“ true and faithful to King William and Queen
“ Mary. And I solemnly profess and declare, that

“ I do from my heart abhor, detest, and renounce,
“ as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine
“ and position, that princes excommunicated, or
“ deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the
“ see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by
“ their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I
“ do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate,
“ state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any
“ power, jurisdiction, superiority, preeminence, or au-
“ thority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.”

The regulations which the Act of Toleration admitted in favour of this sect did honour to the legislature of the day ; and to the religious community, to whose peculiar mode of thinking they were adapted. They indicated in the former a mild and equitable temper ; and they implied that there were traits of character in the latter which entitled them to respect, to commiseration under their sufferings, and to security for the future. It may be inferred from those partial mitigations, had the other dissenters of that day entertained the more just and enlarged views of later times on the subject of religious liberty, the Act of Toleration would have been formed on a more liberal plan. The legislature seems to have been distinguished more by a mild and yielding temper, than by correct ideas or comprehensive views,

In one instance the Toleration Act was marked by a rigorous spirit towards even the Society of Friends. It provided, by an express clause, “ that nothing
“ contained in it should be construed to exempt any

“ of the persons aforesaid, from paying of tithes
“ and other parochial duties to the church or
“ minister, nor from any prosecution in any ec-
“ clesiastical court or elsewhere for the same.”
“ Although,” observes the historian of this sect,
“ the king was principled against persecution,
“ yet this exemption was out of his power [to
“ grant, being prevented by the coronation oath.
“ Many of the prosecutions for these demands evi-
“ dence that the spirit of persecution survived the
“ Act of Toleration, by the severe and oppressive
“ methods adopted by many claimants of tithes for
“ the recovery of their demands.”*

In 1695, many Friends were cast into prison, and severe proceedings were commenced against others, for the non-payment of those demands. Some also were long detained in prison on the charge of contempt of the Courts. It was determined, under these circumstances, to draw up and present to the king a state of their case. This paper professed their peaceable and quiet principles and deportment ; it represented that they were under deep sufferings, in their persons and estates, by tedious imprisonments, seizures, and sequestrations ; that several members of their society had died in prisons ; that many more were under prosecution in England and Wales, to the ruin of many families, chiefly on charges of contempt for not answering upon oath, in cases of tithes, when sued in the exchequer or eccle-

* Gough's History of the People called Quakers, vol. iii. p. 232—236.

fiastical courts, where the process was carried to excommunication. It exhibited, as a plea for the royal interference to relieve their sufferings, various instances, in which, under the preceding reigns, the great severities inflicted upon them had been mitigated or redressed by the exercise of regal influence or prerogative ;—in 1661, by King Charles II's proclamation of grace, which released many from prison ; in 1672, by his letters patent or pardon, pursuant to his declaration of indulgence to tender consciences ; in the 25th year of the reign of that king, by an Act of Parliament granting his Majesty's most gracious and general pardon of *contempts* against the king ; in 1685 and 1688, by divers commissions and two general proclamations of pardon, issued by King James II. ; in the second year of King William and Queen Mary by an act of gracious, general, and free pardon ; by the queen, in releasing a poor innocent woman from a long imprisonment on a fine in the gaol of Lancaster, in the king's absence ; and by the favourable inclination the king had shewn to release two prisoners in Westmoreland, on a petition lately presented to him. The address concluded with soliciting the king, by proclamation or otherwise, as seemed most meet and convenient to his wisdom and clemency, to extend his compassion to the sufferers of that day, for their lawful relief from their confinements, prisons, and hardships.

This case and petition were presented to the king by Messrs. George Whitehead, Gilbert Latey, Thomas Lower, John Taylor, and Daniel Quare :

the last person was known to his Majesty, had ready access to him, and obtained his permission to introduce the others. The king gave them audience, unattended, in a private apartment. He enquired to what places they belonged, and of what congregations they were ministers? This gave Mr. Whitehead an opportunity of explaining the nature of that office, as it was exercised in their society; and of informing his Majesty that it did not imply a permanent connection with a particular congregation, but consisted in visiting, as the LORD inclined them, the meetings of friends, without receiving any stipend. The king made no reply, but seemed very serious, and satisfied with the answer. A copy of the petition was delivered by Messrs. George Whitehead and Gilbert Latey, with the royal approbation, to the lord keeper, Somers; who received it graciously, and assured them of his readiness, as far as the law would admit, to comply with their request; assuring them that the king and himself were really in their principles favourable to liberty of conscience. The pleasing result of this application to the throne was, that in a short time after an Act of Grace was passed, and about forty friends were discharged from prison and restored to liberty.*

The indulgent clause in the Act of Toleration which admitted the people called Quakers to the benefits of that statute, on their declaration, instead of an oath, did not enter into any other Acts which required an oath. Their principle not to swear, not

* Gough, vol. iii. p. 366—399.

to make or take oaths, exposed them for a refusal in many of the transactions of life to great inconveniences and sufferings in person and estate; disabled them from receiving their just debts, or defending their just claims and property; precluded their giving evidence in the courts of judicature, or answers in chancery or exchequer; was a bar to their proving wills and testaments, or taking out letters of administration; prevented their commercial transactions at the Custom-house, and services in manorial courts; deprived them of the use of their franchise in the election of magistrates and Members of Parliament; and was the ground of denying to their young men, who had even faithfully served their apprenticeships, their freedom in cities and boroughs. These were serious evils, and exposed them to unjust and vexatious suits. On these grounds they petitioned the House of Commons, in 1695, for leave to bring in a bill that their solemn affirmation or denial might be accepted instead of an oath; submitting that whosoever in this case should be convicted of falsifying the truth, should undergo like pains and penalties as in law and justice are due unto perjured persons.

A committee was chosen at the meeting for sufferings in London to carry this bill into Parliament with effect. They solicited the members in favour of it by personal applications; and left with them copies of the petition, and a statement of their principles and sufferings on the grounds of conscientious scruple against violating the command of Christ,

“Swear not at all,” which they understood to be a positive prohibition. Some weeks were spent in these previous steps to furnish the members with a clear knowledge of the nature of the case, and to avoid an abrupt and hasty introduction of the petition into the house. Having prepared the minds of the members for a reception of it, they applied to Edmund Waller, esq; the son of the poet of that name, to present it to the house, an office which he cheerfully undertook to do ; and when he moved the reading of it, and asked for leave to bring in a bill formed on the principle of it, the motion was carried by a great majority, and leave accordingly was given. The patrons of the bill, who were active in promoting it, were of opinion, that to give a solemnity to the attestation in the courts of justice, and to render it what Parliament might reasonably require, it was necessary to introduce into the affirmation some explicit and sacred expressions respecting the omniscience of God, as “ I A. B. do declare, in the presence of ALMIGHTY GOD.” The friends of the committee wished to have their simple affirmation or negation accepted, without any appeal to the Divine Being ; but in deference to the opinion of those who advocated their cause, they thought it more eligible to acquiesce, than to risk the losing of the bill. In this form it passed the House of Commons. To facilitate the carrying of the bill through the House of Lords, their case was reprinted and enlarged, and illustrated by reference to the case of the Menonists in Holland; who, since the year 1577,

had been so far indulged, that their *yea* and *nay* were admitted instead of an oath, subject, in case of falsifying, to the same penalties as perjury. Though King William had aimed to supply the vacant sees with men of distinguished moderation, some bishops of the old cast still had seats in the House of Lords. These endeavoured to frustrate the application of the Friends. They proposed, instead of the affirmation as it came from the Commons, that more solemn asseverations should be adopted, viz. “I call God to witness and judge, &c.,” “I call God to record on my soul, and appeal to God as a judge of the truth of what I say, &c.” The committee properly remarked, that these proposed forms of expressions, in which the sacred name of God, as a judge or avenger, was introduced, constituted a new oath; the imposition of which would manifestly defeat the end of their petition to be freed from all oaths as contrary to their conscientious persuasion. The temporal peers, who had taken their sentiments on this subject, returned into the house, and renewed the debate on the bill, and brought the bishops to concur in another amendment, viz. to add after the word *God*, these words, *the witness of the truth*. Having carried this point, they reported it to the Friends, and earnestly persuaded them to acquiesce in the insertion of this additional clause, rather than lose the bill. Finding that they could do no better, it was agreed to leave the matter to the discretion of the temporal peers who espoused their cause. So the bill was finally passed, with an affirmation in

this form,—“ I A. B. do declare in the presence of
“ ALMIGHTY GOD, the witness of the truth of
“ what I say.”

A clause was introduced into this Act relative to the exactment of tithes, empowering two justices of the peace, on the complaint of any parson, vicar, farmer, or proprietor of tithes, or collectors of tithes, that any quaker had refused to pay or compound for the same, or to pay any church-rates, to convene before them such quaker or quakers, and to examine and ascertain on oath what is due or payable on oath by such quaker or quakers to the party or parties complaining; and by order under their hands and seals to direct and appoint the payment thereof, if the sum does not exceed ten pounds; or to levy the money, thereby ordered to be paid, by distress or sale of goods; allowing, however, an appeal from the sentence and proceedings of such two justices to the next general quarter-sessions.

This Act was in force for seven years only; but at the expiration of that term it was renewed for eleven years longer; and in the year 1713 it was made perpetual. The terms of the affirmation still created uneasiness in the minds of many friends, who had conscientious scruples about the use of them; as, in their opinion, too nearly approaching the nature of an oath, by reason of an implied appeal to GOD. A petition was presented to Parliament for another amendment of it in 1721, and the prayer of it was granted.*

* Gough's History, vol. iii. p. 401—412.

While the scruples and grievances of the Society of Friends met with a candid attention and a liberal redress in these points, they were threatened with the operation of a new penal law. Dr. Henry Compton, the bishop of London, brought a bill into the House of Lords, and gave it his warm support, for the better payment of church-rates, small tithes, and other church dues: it was meant to extend the penalties of the Act of 32 Henry VIII. for the recovery of predial tithes and small tithes, repairs of the places of public worship, clerks' wages, and sextons' fees. By the operation of this Act, a person might be subject, for a trifling demand, of perhaps less than a shilling, to the expence of a suit in the ecclesiastical courts; and, in case he did not obey the monition of the judge by paying the demand and costs, to an attachment and a commitment to prison without bail or mainprize: with this addition, that it gave the justices power to grant warrants to distrain the goods of the defendants in such causes, or imprison, if no distrefs could be found.

A bill so threatening and severe naturally awakened the attention of the meeting for sufferings in London. A copy of the bill was procured; and exceptions to it were prepared, to shew its repugnancy to common law and justice, and to represent its injurious aspect on the rights and property of the subject. When the day appointed for a committee of the Lords to sit upon it arrived, some of the friends in London were admitted to an audience. The Bishop of London, as chairman, interrogated them on the

grounds of their objections to it. Mr. Whitehead replied, that the reason assigned in the Act of 17 Charles I. for abolishing the star-chamber and high commission courts, he conceived, with submission, applied to the pending bill; as giving absolute power to the ecclesiastical courts, their judges and ordinaries, to pass definitive sentence without appeal, and conveying to them the power of becoming arbitrary and oppressive. The temporal peers conducted the conference with great civility and kindness: after much discourse, the bishop asked if they had any exceptions to offer in writing. He was answered in the affirmative, and a statement of their exceptions was produced. The general reason against it, offered by Mr. Whitehead, was more fully represented, and the application of it to particular parts of the bill minutely exhibited. Special objections were alleged against the severity of the bill in not admitting or providing for the party cited any legal excuse, in case of absence on a long journey, or being prevented from appearing by occasions of emergency; and against the indiscriminate equality of the penalties which it enacted. It was urged, that it exceeded in severity the statute 32 Henry VIII. c. 7, and invested the ecclesiastical courts with a greater and more absolute power. These representations had their effect. The bill was laid aside.*

When, after the treaty of peace concluded at Ryswick in 1697, addresses of congratulation were presented to the king, from many quarters, and by other

* Gough's History, vol. iii. p. 410—414.

societies of protestants, this society respectfully and gratefully adverted, in their address, to the liberty of conscience granted to his subjects of different persuasions, and especially to their own large participation of his favours, which “ they esteemed it their duty “ gratefully to commemorate and acknowledge, earnestly beseeching ALMIGHTY GOD to assist him to “ prosecute all such his just and good intentions; that “ his days here might be happy and peaceable; and “ he might hereafter partake of a lasting crown “ that would never fade away.”*

The Act of Toleration, even in the more benign aspect which it assumed towards this people, though it restrained, was not, instantly, efficient enough to suppress the spirit of persecution. They did not long enjoy the pacific advantages of that Act without molestation. In 1698, some clergymen of Norfolk, at the instigation of one who had left the society, challenged some friends in the neighbourhood, and others in London, to a public meeting in the parish church of West-Dereham; at which they endeavoured to draw, from many books written by some of the society, with which they had been furnished, conclusions injurious to that community. They were foiled in this attempt. Disappointed in their hopes from a verbal controversy, they had recourse to the press; and published two calumniating tracts, in which they represented the members of the society as seditious, and their principles as blasphemous: and to prepare the way for further attempts against

* Gough's History, vol. iii. p. 416.

the security and peace of this society, they presented these tracts to the members of Parliament. Mr. George Whitehead was active in preparing answers to these pamphlets, both to detect their ungenerous aims, and to refute their injurious and acrimonious assertions. In the mean time Mr. William Penn drew up, printed, and circulated among the members, a brief and manly remonstrance against the aspersions and conduct of the clergy; expressing not “a surprise at being evilly intreated, but a just expectation, that if conscience prevailed more than contention, and charity over-ruled prejudice, they might hope for fairer quarter than from their adversaries.” Neither ashamed nor overawed by this remonstrance, the clergy and their abettors proceeded in their design, and presented to the House of Commons a petition against the Society of Friends, replete with general invectives. They expressed their resentment at the daily increase of the Quakers, and the *mischiefs* and *dangers* which this increase threatened to the nation: they affected to suspect their teachers of being *Romish emissaries* in disguise; whom they charged with boldly spreading their venomous doctrines every where under pretensions to a divine inspiration; and they professed to be alarmed at the tendency of their *blasphemous books* and *pernicious principles*, as tending to subvert the fundamentals of christianity, and to undermine the civil government. The prayer of the petition was, “that the principles and practices of this people might be strictly examined, and censured, and suppressed, as to the

“ wisdom of the House might seem expedient, with
“ whatsoever tenderness to their persons and estates.”

As if, truly, penal statutes, destroying the liberty and ruining the estates of men, could consist with much tenderness and ^{le}gity; as if imprisonment and fines were measures of mildness.

Two clergymen, Mr. John Meriton and Mr. L. Topcliff, attended at the House to solicit some Members to introduce the petition. A copy of it had been procured by the active partizans of the society, who shewed it to several Members of Parliament; and pointed out its direct tendency to make void the Act of Toleration, and to supersede the liberty of conscience granted by the government. The times were now changed, and more liberal sentiments were adopted in respect to religious liberty, than had prevailed in former reigns. The members of Parliament determined to set their faces against a petition, the malignant consequences of which were at first obvious. The representatives of the county, into whose hands it had been put, were indeed brought into a dilemma; under the prospect of disobliging the clergy and their adherents, or of acting contrary to their own judgment, and the general sentiments of the House. On mature deliberation they declined moving it on a petition, which they were sensible would be immediately rejected. This conduct, however, though at once wise and liberal, did not discourage the corporation of St. Edmundsbury, in Suffolk, from bringing forward another petition of the same spirit and tendency. It represented that

no ancient heresies had ever been so formidable in their rise and progress as was that of the quakers ; who, it stated, were “ in their clandestine constitution opposite to the established policy ; in their principles of faith, antichristian ; of government, antimonarchical ; in points of doctrine, antiscriptural ; and in practices, as to their monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, illegal.” This petition, after the rejection of that from Norfolk, was soon disposed of. The members for Suffolk, who had declared their aversion from the principles of that application to the House, would not violate their own judgment and consistency of character so far as to introduce this ; and to the mortification of those magistrates who, during the existence of the penal laws, had signalized their promptitude to persecution, this attempt to regain the power of harassing their innocent fellow-subjects was defeated by the suppression of their petition.*

The last act of the general body of the Society of Friends in this period of their history was an address to the throne. After the Parliament had settled the succession to the crown in Sophia the Electress of Hanover and her heirs, and while King William was in Holland, the superseded monarch, James II. died on the 17th September 1700, at the palace of Germain's in France ; and his son, by order of the French sovereign, was proclaimed King of the British. This measure of the French court roused the general indignation of the English ; and

* Gough, p. 418—423.

on the king's return from the Continent addresses were sent from all quarters, expressive of gratitude for the revolution, and of loyalty to him and to the house of Hanover. The Society of Friends, who heretofore had been constrained to lay before the throne complaints of grievances, were ready on this occasion, with a lively sense of the liberty and favour which they enjoyed, to approach it with warm sentiments of duty and gratitude in an address, presented by their respectable members George Whitehead, William Mead, and Francis Camfield, to "a prince whom they believed God had promoted and principled for the good ends of government; whom God by his almighty power had eminently preserved, and made exemplary in prudence as well as goodness to other kings and princes, whereby his memorial would be renowned to posterity." Their address was favourably received by the king, who in answer replied, "I have protected you, and shall protect you:" and on a perusal of it in his closet, it was understood that he expressed his particular approbation. It was some years before it appeared in the Gazette; and such was the spirit of the times, that advantage was taken of this delay to deceive the public by a ridiculous fabrication, published in some of the newspapers, as their address, in which they were represented as using expressions so blunt and unmannerly as bespoke audacity and insolence rather than the honest simplicity of this society. Such representations served to gratify spleen, and to make an im-

pression on prejudiced minds; though the forgery was soon detected by the publication of the real address.*

Some characters which appeared during these times in this community, have received from the pen of its historian a particular tribute of respect. Among these was *Alexander Parker*, born near Bolton in Lancashire, who, at an early period of his life, embraced the principles of this people, and became an eminent minister among them. He was the companion of George Fox, when he was sent up by Colonel Hacket to Oliver Cromwell; and travelled with him on various journies, in different parts of England, in Scotland, and into Holland, in 1684. “He was one in the number of the worthies of that age who were given up to the service of their Maker, and to the promoting of pure religion and the practice of piety, as the principal purpose of their lives.” With this view he took many journies by himself in the exercise of his ministry. He several times suffered by imprisonment and fines. The last twenty years of his life he resided in London, and was very serviceable with others in solicitations to government for the relief of their friends under sufferings; for which offices the comeliness of his person and deportment particularly qualified him. He was the author of several treatises and epistles to the society; and concluded his active and benevolent exertions and well-spent life with great peace on the 9th of March 1688—9.†

* Gough, p. 455—458.

† Gough, p. 237—8.

Another member of the Society of Friends at this period, who distinguished himself by his virtues and labours, was *Mr. Robert Lodge*, a frequent companion of Mr. John Burnyeat in his ministry and journies in Ireland. He was born about the year 1636, at Masham in Yorkshire, in which place he afterwards resided. In his youth his mind had a strong tincture of religion, and his understanding was opened to behold it under such views of its purity and refinement, before he had heard of the people called quakers, that in frequent conversations which he had with the clergy, he discovered apprehensions of its nature superior to those which were entertained by them. On the appearance of some members of that society in his neighbourhood, about the year 1654, he embraced their sentiments in the eighteenth year of his age. He was afterwards looked on as possessing eminent gifts for the ministry, and travelled in the exercise of it through different parts of England and Ireland; and was instrumental to awaken in many serious consideration of their ways, and religious desires after the attainment of peace and future happiness. He was twice imprisoned; once at York 1660, and again at Wakefield in 1665. He died on the 7th of July 1690, with a serenity of mind which supported him above the fear of death, like one falling into an easy sleep. His last words were "Blessed be God, I have heavenly peace." "He was a man," we are told, "of an amiable disposition, cultivated by pure religion; a preacher of righteousness, no

“ less in the whole tenour of his life and circumspect
“ conversation than in word or doctrine ; whereby
“ he acquired the general esteem of his friends and
“ neighbours, and left an honourable and spotless
“ reputation behind him.”

In the same year died *Mr. Thomas Salthouse*, an intimate in the family of Judge Fell, when Mr. George Fox came to Swarthmore; whose preaching wrought conviction in him, and in the greatest part of the family. Having been commissioned to preach, he spent a considerable portion of his life in travelling, and labouring to promote, particularly in the western counties, the reception of what he deemed to be the truth ; and for his testimony to it he suffered repeated imprisonments, attended with circumstances of severity and ignominy ; being detained in gaol, (when those who had been apprehended with him, had been released,) through his inability to pay fines, or to procure securities on account of his great distance from home, as well as being treated as a vagrant. After some years he appears to have married and settled in Cornwall ; but he continued frequently to visit different parts of the kingdom ; and although he escaped imprisonment, he was not secure against the malignity of informers. At the funeral of a respectable member of the society in December 1681, he addressed a mixed audience, in a suitable exhortation
“ to seriousness and sobriety, reminding them of the
“ certainty of death and judgment, and a retribution
“ according to their works.” “ On such an occasion,

“ and to such an assembly of many good Christians,
“ loyal subjects, and professors of the protestant
“ religion, one would scarcely expect,” observes the
historian, “ that reminding men of their mortality,
“ and inciting them to prepare for death, could have
“ been liable to the penalties of the law :” yet upon
the oath of two informers several present were con-
victed unheard, and fined for a conventicle by three
justices ; and the goods in the shop of Mr. Salthouse
were distrained to the value of 29l. 9s. 9d. to pay
a fine of 20l. for preaching. In 1683, he and
several others were committed to Launceston gaol ;
and for declining to take an oath, they were brought
to the summer assizes, where the oath was again
tendered to them in open court. Upon conviction
of refusing it, they were on a sentence of *præmunire*
detained three years in prison, till King James’s
general pardon released them. After this, Mr.
Salthouse renewed and continued his pastoral visits,
till, about the 60th year of his age, death deter-
mined all his labours and sufferings. He is spoken
of as “ a man of good natural capacity, and adorned
“ with an excellent gift in the ministry ; remarkably
“ affable and pleasant in his conversation, which
“ procured him the respectful regard of many others
“ as well as of friends.” He addressed to them some
excellent epistles, and was the author of some
valuable tracts.*

A third character which recommends itself to our
notice in the biography of the Society of Friends,
at this period, is that of *Mr. Charles Marshall*,

* Gough, ut ante, p. 255—258.

born in Bristol in April 1637; by profession an apothecary and chemist; a man who was accounted worthy of double honour in his own religious community; and who, for the innocence and integrity of his life, had obtained a good respect among his acquaintance and neighbours. He descended from religious and virtuous parents, who, as the faithful guardians of his tender youth, directed his education with a view at once to the cultivation of virtuous dispositions in him, and to the furnishing of his mind with literature. His mother took him to the religious assemblies of the Independents which she frequented, and sometimes to those of the baptists; and he accompanied her to hear ministers of every denomination who were in the greatest reputation for zeal, experience, and piety. He himself from his childhood conceived an abhorrence of every degree of profaneness and immorality, and delighted in reading the scriptures. He accustomed himself, as he advanced in years, to spend much time in the fields and woods, out of the sight and observation of men, in the exercises of devotion. His inducement to this was a dissatisfaction with the conduct of many in the different religious communities of the day, on account of their having fallen, as he conceived, into a mere lifeless and empty profession. He had therefore left them, and accustomed himself to these solitary retirements, and also associated with some other persons who thought as he did. He spent one day in the week with them in fasting and prayer, seeking relief from a conflict of spirit, in their reli-

gious feelings and views. This select party was visited, in 1654, by Mr. John Cam and Mr. John Auckland, ministers among the people called quakers. The preaching of the latter arrested the attention of Mr. Marshall, and brought him over to his sentiments. After many years, in 1670, he became a minister among them. In the same year he commenced his travels in that character, through the neighbouring counties of Wiltshire and Gloucestershire, and pursued them so far as to Kendal in Westmoreland, returning through Cheshire and Worcestershire. He continued his journies to the year 1672, without any interruption from informers, either by imprisonment or by levying of fines under the Conventicle Act. He experienced many deliverances from difficulties and dangers which attended him. At one time having the sands to cross near Ulverston in Lancashire, he was on the point of attempting it, in company with four others, being told by two persons who lived on the other side of the river that he might do it with safety; but stopping from an impression on his own mind, he received intelligence that it would be dangerous to venture to do it at that time, and desisted; and in about an hour the sea overflowed the sands to the extent of several miles. In 1674, he was dragged through a gallery out of the meeting-house at Claverton in Somersetshire, with so much violence, by a magistrate, that it caused a spitting of blood, and was attended with a contusion, of which he long after complained. He was a great sufferer in the

forfeiture of his goods for tithes; and in 1682, was confined, by a prosecution before the barons of the exchequer, two years in Fleet prison. He met with many trials of his faith and patience, in his assiduous endeavours, conjointly with Mr. George Fox, to heal dissensions which broke out about 1677, in the Society of Friends, in consequence of the opposition made by John Wilkinson and John Story to the establishment of an orderly discipline. He continued his labours and journies, with many trying exercises of body and mind, for the greatest part of twenty years; giving up his time, substance, and strength, to the objects of his ministry. On his last journey to Bristol and the Western Counties, in 1698, he was visited with a lingering indisposition, which, according to a presage and settled opinion of his own mind, proved mortal. Having passed a life of faithfulness, integrity, and extensive benevolence, in the service of God and man, he felt, in the assured prospect of his approaching change, that the work of righteousness was peace, and the effect thereof, quietness and assurance for ever. His expressions and counsels to those who visited him in an illness of four months, frequently attended with great pain, clearly evidenced that he felt no decay in love to his brethren, in universal benevolence, or in his spiritual abilities; and borne up superior to his affliction by the security of his conscience, he was strengthened to bear his painful sensations with much patience and calm resignation to the divine will. He strongly recommended to some of his

brethren in the ministry two things, which were weightily impressed upon his own mind. One point which he urged on their attention, to use his own words, was, “ that they would gather down unto
“ the immortal seed and word of life in themselves,
“ and be exercised in it before the LORD ; and duly
“ prize and set a right value upon the many out-
“ ward and inward blessings that the LORD has
“ eminently bestowed upon them since the morning
“ of the day of his blessed visitation ; then shall they
“ grow and be preserved in a living freshness to Him,
“ and the LORD will continue his mercies to them,
“ and they shall not want his divine refreshing pre-
“ sence in their meetings together before Him.”

The second was that “ those friends to whom the
“ LORD had given great estates, ought to cast their
“ bread upon the waters, and to do good therewith
“ in their life time ; for those that are enjoyers of
“ such things, should see that they be good stewards
“ thereof.” As his last moments approached, he closed his eyes with his own hands, and with composure of mind resigned his soul to God in the 62d year of his age. He was himself a living example of that virtuous and holy conduct which he inculcated ; he was the advocate of the poor with the opulent, recommending self-denial, hospitality, and liberality, rather than high living ; and the charity to which he exhorted others he exhibited in his own practice, particularly in supplying the sick with advice and medicine, the hungry with food, and the naked with raiment.

Mr. John Crook was another member of the Society of Friends, whose name is come down to us with peculiar testimonies of respect. He was a man of literature, possessed a good estate, and was in the commission of the peace for Bedfordshire. In the year 1654, and about the 37th of his age, convinced by the ministry of Mr. George Fox and Mr. William Dewsbury, he embraced the principles of the Friends, and became a member of their community. On this his commission was taken away. He entered with such ardour of feeling into the sentiments and spirit of this body of christians, that he became not only a very serviceable member of their community, but a preacher of distinguished gifts, “as an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, and highly esteemed.” As long as the state of his health permitted, till he was disabled by a complication of painful maladies, he travelled as a minister through different parts of the nation, particularly in Bedfordshire and the neighbouring counties. He was a great sufferer for the testimony of a good conscience, being repeatedly exposed to the severities of unmerited prosecutions. At different times he was confined for months in the gaols of Newgate, Huntingdon, and Aylesbury. On the 25th of June 1662, Mr. Crook, with two other brethren, one a physician, and the other a goldsmith, men of property and character, without being charged with any crime, or the ground of an indictment, were tried at the bar of the Old Bailey, and a sentence of *præmunire* was passed on them for

refusing to take the oath of allegiance before Judge Twisden. On this occasion Mr. Crook pleaded with ability and intrepidity, on the principles of the English constitution and laws, against the illegal proceedings of the court. He and his fellow prisoners demanded, before the jury brought in their verdict, their privilege to make their defence; but it was refused them. The Chief Judge on the bench remarked, that “if the quakers had liberty to speak, they would make themselves famous, and their judges odious.” An officer of the court was commanded to stop their mouths, which he did with a dirty cloth. Immediately after sentence was passed, their estates were seized. On the 23d of July they were set at liberty, it was supposed, by the king’s order. During their confinement Mr. Crook drew up and committed to the press, a narrative of the trial; “that the king and nation might not be ignorant of the measures pursued, and their tendency to despotism, and the ruin of the subject.”* As Mr. Crook advanced in life he was afflicted with frequent and severe paroxysms of the stone, during which he was never known to utter an impatient word; and when the extremity of the fit was over, he would thankfully express the inward joy and peace of mind that he had felt in it. He died on the 26th April 1699, at his house in Hertford, in the 82d year of his age. Mr. Gough has preserved a letter to his children and grandchildren, written scarcely two months before his death, full of

* Gough, vol. i. p. 518—526.

weighty counsels, expressed with vigour, and breathing a spirit of elevated piety.*

We have reserved for this place the names of two most distinguished members of the Society of Friends. They died, indeed, before those whom we have already noticed ; but they may with propriety close the list of worthies in that community, as persons justly held in peculiar respect. The individuals to whom we relate were Rob. Barclay and George Fox.

Mr. Robert Barclay, the son of Colonel David Barclay,† was born at Edinburgh in the year 1648. He was descended on the paternal side from the ancient and honourable family of the Barclays, of Mathers, in the kingdom of Scotland ; and on the maternal, from that of Catherine Gordon, of the house of the Duke of Gordon. The first rudiments of his education were received among the Calvinists in his own country. In an early period of his life he was removed to Paris, for a more extensive education, under the tuition of his uncle, president of the Scotch college in that city. Here he received, from the impressions made on his immature judgment, a strong bias in favour of the principles of the Catholic faith. In 1664, he returned home ; having acquired a competent knowledge of the sciences, and attained to a great proficiency in the French and Latin tongues. He could write and speak the latter language with great facility and correctness ; and he afterwards made himself master of

* Gough, vol. iii. p. 433—441.

† See the last edition of Neal, vol. v. p. 117.

the Greek and Hebrew. During his absence his father joined in fellowship with the people called quakers. The religious conversation and circum-spect example of his father, and his intercourse with others of the same profession, directed the attention of the young Barclay to their principles; disposed him to think very favourable of their religious views, as producing a conduct in life remarkably consistent with the precepts and spirit of the gospel; and induced him to attend their meetings. In the 19th year of his age he made a public profession of their sentiments, and became an active and zealous member of their community; and received the ministry among them as his greatest honour. A clear conception, an extensive reach of thought, a close and convincing manner of reasoning, delivered in a plain, unaffected, neat style, combined with considerable literary attainments, in union with a calmness of temper, qualified him to be, both in writing and discourse, an able and powerful advocate of the society to which he had joined himself. In 1675, on the 14th of February, he and Mr. George Keith held a public disputation with some students in divinity, at Aberdeen, on the principles of their religious profession; the students, having numbers on their side, handled the subject that came into discussion with disgraceful levity, fell into clamour and personal abuse, and vaunted themselves in a victory which they had not obtained. The disputation ended as usual in tumult and disorder, and also with throwing of clods and stones. Four students who

were present, but not disputants, were, however, so impressed with the arguments offered by the advocates of the Friends, that they joined the society. Mr. Barclay afterwards published “ a true and faithful account of the most material passages of this Disputation, conducted before some hundreds of witnesses.” In 1676, some members of the Society, to the number of thirty-four, were cast into prison by the magistrates of Edinburgh, on the ground of a declaration issued by the council to enforce the Acts of Parliament against conventicles; and were detained three months, before they were called to the tribunal of the commissioners of the privy council, to hear the libel exhibited against them, and to set up their defence. After an hour or two spent by the court in deliberation on their defence, the prisoners were called in one by one, and severally asked, “ Whether they would oblige themselves not to go any more to meeting ?” which every one of them refusing to do, some of them, among whom was Mr. Barclay’s father, were fined each one fourth of their respective valued rents for keeping conventicles; and an eighth part of the said valued rents each for withdrawing from the public worship; and several were fined to an eighth part for their wives’ transgressions in the same way. Others who were not possessed of landed property, were fined in sums of money of 40l. 30l. 25l. or less each; and all were remanded to prison till the fines were paid. Their numbers were soon increased by the repeated imprisonments of others, apprehended at religious meet-

ings. On this, Mr. Barclay being in London, gained admittance to the king, delivered to him a narrative of the proceedings and of the severity of the magistrates, and interceded that the case of his imprisoned friends might be recommended to the favourable notice of the Council of Scotland. The king accordingly directed the Earl of Lauderdale to recommend it to their consideration. The council referred it to their former commissioners, in conjunction with three others. In the issue it was decreed that on paying their fines they should be released, as were the next morning all who had been imprisoned since the others were fined.

In 1677, Mr. Barclay accompanied his friends, William Penn, George Fox, and George Keith, on a journey to Holland, to visit the members of their community in the United States, and in some parts of Germany. Barclay and Penn proceeded to Kerford, the residence of Elizabeth Princess Palatine, and aunt to King George I. who, under a solicitous concern of mind on a religious account, had carried on an epistolary correspondence with Mr. Penn.* Mr. Barclay is said on this tour to have recommended his doctrines, not only by the exemplariness of his manners, but by the cheerfulness and agreeableness of his conversation. In 1677, Mr. Barclay presented an excellent letter to the public ministers assembled in a congress, held at Nimeguen, to restore the peace of Europe; copies of it in Latin were delivered to the ambassadors of the Emperor, of the kings of Great-

* Gough, vol. ii. p. 217, 458, 466, 485.

Britain, Spain, France, Sweden, the States General, &c.; and were received, it is related, with great marks of esteem and respect. The author informs them, that a sight of the miseries produced by war, which he witnessed on his visit to Holland and Germany, first suggested to him the idea of writing this address. The design of it was to lay open the true causes of war and bloodshed; the dreadful and barbarous consequences attending it; and the only certain and undeniable means of attaining, by the pursuit of christian principles, true, lasting, and solid peace. Voltaire remarks on this tour through the continent by Mr. Barclay and his associates, “The Friends sowed the good seed in Germany, but reaped very little fruit; for the mode of *thee-ing* and *thou-ing* was not approved of in a country where a man is perpetually obliged to employ the titles of Highness and Excellency.”*

Mr. Barclay after this “passed his life in a peaceful retirement; having a large family, which he governed with great dignity, wisdom, and discretion; living always decently and honourably upon his own fortune, which was considerable.” He had attained only to the 42d year of his age, when he died at his own house at Ury, in Scotland, on the 3d of October 1690. His sickness was short, his temper of mind through it was calm and serene; and he closed his eyes with firm confidence in God. A friend, in his course of travels through those parts, calling on him, he expressed his love to

* Goadby’s British Biography, vol. vii. p. 142.

all the faithful friends in England, who kept their integrity in the truth; and desired that the assurance of his affection might be carried to the friends in Cumberland where his visitor resided, and at Swarthmore, and to the faithful every where, adding, “ God is good still, and though I am under
“ a great weight of weakness and sickness, yet my
“ peace flows; and this I know, whatever exercises
“ may be permitted to come upon me, they shall
“ tend to God’s glory and my salvation, and in that
“ I rest.” Ample and honourable testimonies were borne to his character and talents by those of his own persuasion.* The eulogy on him by Mr. Wm. Penn, who was well acquainted with him, may be acceptable to the reader. “ He loved the truth and
“ way of God, as revealed among us, above all
“ the world, and was not ashamed of it before men,
“ but bold and able in maintaining it; sound in
“ judgment, strong in argument, cheerful in suffer-
“ ings; of a pleasant disposition, yet solid, plain,
“ and exemplary in conversation. He was a learned
“ man, a good christian, an able minister, a dutiful
“ son, a loving husband, a tender and careful father,
“ an easy master, and a good and kind neighbour
“ and friend. These eminent qualities in one who
“ employed them so serviceably, and who had not
“ lived much above half the life of a man, aggravated the loss of him, especially in that nation
“ where he lived.” A more modern writer, in very

* For specimens of which see Gough, vol. iii. p. 247—8; and Kippis’s Biographia Britannica, vol. i. p. 599, &c. note l.

expressive and handsome terms, has concisely drawn his character: “ He was a man of eminent learning
 “ and abilities, sincerely pious, and uniformly vir-
 “ tuous. He was very benevolent and charitable,
 “ and remarkable for the government of his passions,
 “ and the meekness and sweetness of his temper.”*

A Scots poet, writing of Mr. Barclay’s two brothers, William and John, concludes with these verses upon Robert:

“ But lo ! a third appears, with serious air,
 “ His Prince’s darling, and his country’s care.
 “ See his religion, which so late before
 “ Was like a jumbled mass of dross and ore,
 “ Refined by him, and burnish’d o’er with art,
 “ Awakes the spirit, and attracts the heart.”

After his decease, Dr. Kippis informs us, his widow received many letters of condolence, not only from friends of his own religious persuasion, but from other persons of rank and character. Seven children survived him, all of whom were alive in October 1740, fifty years after their father’s death. His descendants at that time amounted to between sixty and seventy.†

His works, admired for the strength and power of reasoning which they display, and for the perspicuity and accuracy of language in which they are written, were collected together, and published in London in 1692. Besides the tracts already mentioned, the most distinguished of his publications

* Goadby’s British Biography, vol. vii. p. 143.

† Biographia Britannica, vol. i. p. 602.

were, “The Anarchy of the Ranters,” (a sect of that day) “and other Libertines;” “The Hierarchy of the Romanists and other pretended churches equally refused and refuted, in a two-fold apology for the church and people of God, called in derision Quakers, &c.” This is pronounced to be a learned and excellent treatise, containing as much sound reasoning as any book of its size in ours, or perhaps in any modern language.” Another treatise, in which many weighty points are discussed with great judgment and moderation, and which exhibits a noble description of christian beneficence, penned by him in the prison of Aberdeen, was entitled, “Universal Love considered, and established upon its right foundation, &c.” But the most celebrated of his works was his “Apology” for the Quakers, published in Latin at Amsterdam in 1676, in 4to. Two copies of it were immediately sent to each of the public ministers, then at the Congress of Nimeguen, who received it with all imaginable favour and respect. In 1678, the author published an English translation of it, and it was quickly translated into High Dutch, Low Dutch, French, and Spanish. It has been universally allowed to surpass every thing of its kind, and to set the principles of the Society, in whose defence it was written, in the fairest light possible. The numerous answers to it at home and abroad only contributed to make it more read and more esteemed. It has given to the name of the author a diffusive and permanent celebrity and reputation. A very elegant edition of it

came from the press of Mr. Baskerville.* It reflects no honour on the candour and impartiality of the German ecclesiastical historian Mosheim, that he endeavours to depreciate this elaborate work; ascribes to the author a duplicity foreign to his real character; and insinuates that he has given a fallacious account of the principles of the Quakers: whereas it has been observed by another biographer, “ that
 “ the most bitter of his antagonists have constantly
 “ owned that the author of the ‘Apology’ was a
 “ man of great candour and charity; one who loved
 “ truth sincerely; and did not make use of his great
 “ learning and abilities in order to impose, by the
 “ strength of them, his own opinions on weaker
 “ minds.” A writer of the French Encyclopédie, under the word Quaker, has declared, “ I am not
 “ ashamed to own that I have read Robert Bar-
 “ clay’s Apology for Quakerism over and over
 “ again with singular satisfaction; and am con-
 “ vinced that, taken altogether, it is the most rea-
 “ sonable and most perfect system which has ever
 “ been conceived.”§

This work is addressed to King Charles II. in a dedication, as important, curious, and extraordinary as any part of it. Among many striking passages the following has been selected as a specimen of the manly freedom, of the strong yet decent strain of it.
 “ There is no king in the world who can so experi-

* For a list of the Answers to the Apology, see Biogr. Britan. vol. i. p. 596, note f.

§ Biogr. Brit. vol. i. p. 597, note f.; and Gough, vol. ii. p. 405.

“ mentally testify of God’s providence and good-
“ nefs ; neither is there any who rules so many free
“ people, so many true christians; which thing ren-
“ ders thy government more honourable, thyself
“ more considerable, than the accession of many
“ nations filled with slavish and superstitious souls.
“ Thou hast tasted of prosperity and adversity ; thou
“ knowest what it is to be banished from thy native
“ country ; to be over-ruled, as well as to rule and
“ sit upon the throne ; and being oppressed, thou
“ hast reason to know how hateful the oppressor is
“ both to God and man. If, after all those warn-
“ ings and advertisements, thou dost not return unto
“ the LORD with all thy heart, but forget Him who
“ remembered thee in thy distress, and give up thy-
“ self to follow lust and vanity, surely great will be
“ thy condemnation.”

About the time of Mr. Barclay’s birth, *Mr. Geo. Fox*, who is regarded as the author and founder of the sect called Quakers, began to preach. He was born at Drayton in Lancashire, 1624. About the year 1648, he commenced public teacher in Manchester, and its neighbouring towns. From this spot he extended his journies and labours through the counties of Derby, Leicester, and Northampton ; insisting on his leading principle, “ that every man was enlight-
“ ened by the divine light of Christ ;” inveighing against injustice, drunkenness, and other prevalent vices ; and under an apprehension that he had received a divine command, assuming a particular style of addressing persons, and refraining from the usual

modes of expressing civility and respect to others.* He exposed himself, both by his preaching and singularities of practice, to reproach and insult ; was repeatedly cast into prison in various towns ; and at times scarcely escaped with his life from the madness of an infuriated mob. The trial of confinement was often aggravated by peculiar circumstances of rigour and hardship ; by the menaces of jailors ; by rudeness and incivility ; by the exclusion of friends who were not permitted to visit him ; by the intrusion of enemies, who were allowed to force their company on him, to gaze at him, and dispute with him ; by the peculiar incommodiousness of his apartments, and by the nuisances attached to them. Previously to the period at which we now take up his history, Mr. Fox, in company with other members of his religious community, took shipping from England in 1671, to visit the West-Indies and other parts of the British dominions in America. After a passage of nearly two months they landed at Barbadoes. Here, before and after some of his friends had left him and proceeded to the islands of Antigua and Nevis, he held many large and satisfactory meetings both for worship and discipline, free from any interruption from the governor, who had received him on his visit with remarkable kindness. From Barbadoes he passed over to Jamaica, in company with some adherents to his principles. The governor, magistrates, and people in general, afforded them a kind reception. Their meetings were quiet and numerous.

* Our edition of Neal, vol. iv. p. 31, and notes, p. 34—5, and notes p. 36, 275, 502, 503, 509, 643.

Many, and amongst them some persons of the higher class, were brought over to their profession. We next find him and some of his coadjutors in Maryland, after a tedious and difficult passage, owing to contrary and tempestuous winds, through the Gulf of Florida. But these pious worthies, zealous of the cause of, as it appeared to their minds, evangelical truth, were not discouraged or diverted from their active exertions by perils by land or perils by sea. Soon after their disembarking, they joined a general meeting of friends held for four days at West River, and after this another at Cliffs. These two general meetings being over, the friends from Europe parted company. Mr. Fox, and they who joined him, sailed by boat to the eastern shore, where they held meetings; at which, besides many persons of quality of the country, one of the Indian kings and some other Indians attended, who owned the truth of his doctrine, and desired that it might be stated to their people. They then took their journey to New England, an enterprize of great difficulty and peril. In their journey they spent some little time in Long Island, and attended a half-yearly meeting of friends, for four days, at Oyster-Bay. After some stay in Long Island, they proceeded by ship to Rhode Island, to attend the general meeting to be convened there for the province of New England, which continued by adjournments six days. His next stage was at Shrewsbury in East-Jersey. From this place, with the assistance of Indian guides, they pursued their journey through the woods to

Maryland. After contending with numerous difficulties, they reached Newcastle in five days, where Mr. Fox was hospitably entertained by the governor, and held a large meeting at his house ; which afforded great satisfaction to the people, who in tenderness confessed the truth of the doctrines published amongst them. In three days of very severe travelling, they reached the house of a friend at Myles River in Maryland ; where they held several meetings, both amongst the inhabitants, and amongst the Indians, to whom Mr. Fox spoke by an interpreter, who were very seriously attentive to his doctrine, and shewed a very affectionate respect to himself. They next visited Virginia and Carolina. Their labours were not confined to the precincts of the English government, but they included in their tours, stimulated by the sentiment of universal love, the Indians in the back settlements, whom they addressed by an interpreter ; and who well received their labours, professing that “ they understood “ what was spoken, and that it was very good.” In 1673, he embarked at Potuxant for Bristol. It is a proof of the philanthropy and equity of Mr. Fox’s spirit and principles, that he exhorted the members of the society to exercise peculiar kindness towards their negro slaves, to instruct them in christianity, and to instill into them the fear of their Creator ; to see that their overseers treated them with humanity and gentleness ; and after certain years of servitude to set them free. This generous advice, which was approved and observed by the members of the

society of friends, gave offence to the other inhabitants at Barbadoes, and excited a general alarm.* Alike honourable to Mr. Fox is the epistle, which in the year 1682, full of anxious concern for the conduct of his friends in every quarter of the world, he wrote to those in Pennsylvania and the adjacent provinces, in an elevated strain of morality, exhorting them to justice and liberality in all commercial transactions. He advised them not to let avarice tempt them to take advantage of the circumstances or necessity of others, or to enhance their gain in exorbitant profits, but to sell on moderate terms. On the other hand, when the prices were too low to give a profit equal to the necessary occasions of the proprietors, to purchase at an advanced rate, having an eye more to the public good than to private interest. To beware of setting their hearts on riches, if their trade increased through a reputation for justice and fair dealing, lest they should lose the image of God, in which the dominion over the creature is retained. Not to extend trade beyond their capitals and their ability to manage it: to circumscribe themselves within such limits as would enable them to be punctual to their engagements, and regular in their payments. Not to let out their desires after extensive possessions and greatness in the world, lest they should be absorbed in the incumbrances thereof, like the rich fool in the parable, whose barns were too little: earnestly enjoining the practice of righteousness, fidelity, and mercy, on

* Gough, vol. iii, p. 49.

those who were magistrates, or advanced to public trusts, by the exhortations of scripture.*

After his return to England Mr. Fox was cast into Worcester gaol, on the ridiculous charge of having “held a meeting from all parts of the nation “for terrifying the king’s subjects.” During his imprisonment he was attacked with an alarming sickness, and his recovery was very doubtful. His wife, (who was the widow of Judge Felt,) to whom he was married in 1669, went to London to petition the king for his release ; which he was willing to grant in the mode of a pardon : this, as it seemed to imply, if not an acknowledgment, yet consciousness of guilt, Mr. Fox declined to accept, and chose rather to await the decision of a court of justice. By his trial, after a severe confinement of two years, he was honourably acquitted. He then went to Holland. On his coming home, a suit was instituted against him for refusing to pay tithes. His opponents were successful, and he was obliged to submit to the consequences.† In 1684 he again visited the continent ; and on his return, finding his health and spirits were much impaired by incessant fatigues and long imprisonments, he desisted from travelling, and spent his latter years in London and its vicinity, as affording him an opportunity of rendering the most essential services to his friends, especially to such as were under persecution. He continued his public duties as a minister till within a few days of

* Gough, vol. iii. p. 247, 248.

† Rees’ Cyclopædia, 4to. article, George Fox.

his death, which happened, after a short illness, on the 13th of January 1690, when he was in the 67th year of his age. Mr. William Penn, who was with him, reports, that he was so calm in his spirits to the last, as if death were hardly worth notice, recommending to those about him the dispersion of “an epistle he had lately written, and, “above all, the care of friends, especially those in “Ireland and America;” twice over repeating, “mind “poor friends in Ireland and America.” To some who visited him, and enquired how he felt, he answered, “Never heed; the LORD’s presence is over “all weakness and death; the seed reigns; blessed “be the LORD.” He was tall and corpulent; very temperate, eating little and sleeping less; a man of good natural talents, and very conversant in the scriptures; though his expressions might sound uncouth and unfashionable to nice ears, his matter was instructive, weighty, and profound; and he excelled in prayer. The reverence and solemnity of his address and behaviour, and the fervency and fullness of his words, often struck strangers with admiration. “To man he was an original, being no “man’s copy.” High commendation is bestowed on his meekness, humility, and moderation. His sufferings bore testimony to his fortitude, patience, and resignation: his piety, sincerity, and purity of intention, were evinced by his incessant zeal through life. His funeral was attended by a great concourse of friends, and others of various parties. His

works were collected in three volumes folio ; consisting of his journal, epistles, and doctrinal treatises.†

† Encyclopædia, ut ante ; Gough, vol. iii. p. 48, 52, 56, 83, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 101, 102, 103, 250, 254.

CHAPTER IV.

NEW CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

THE mind turns with pleasure from a survey of the collision of sentiments among various sects, and of the interests of peculiar parties, to the review of measures that unite men in the pursuit of one good design; or raise in their breasts an emulation in promoting knowledge and virtue, and advancing the improvement of mankind. If the period through which we have carried our historical research was marked by contests and dissensions, by sufferings nobly supported, by virtuous struggles in the cause of liberty, and by mutual bickerings and jealousies, it was distinguished by the commencement of several benevolent institutions, and by the execution of plans of extensive usefulness.

When zealous protestants, alarmed by the spirit and measures of the government in the reign of James II. were distressed with apprehensions of the rapid spread of Popery, many in and about the metropolis held meetings for instruction and devotion. Such associations had hitherto been maintained only by the puritans and dissenters. The members of

the established church now entered into them with seriousness and ardour ; and applied to their ministers, Dr. afterwards Bishop Beveridge, and Dr. Horneck, preacher at the Savoy, to afford them direction and superintendance, and to supply them with forms of prayer. Besides the rules for the management of their meetings, it was particularly recommended to the members of these societies, “ to love one another : “ when reviled, not to revile again : to speak evil “ of no man : to wrong no man : to pray, if pos- “ sible, seven times a day : to keep close to the “ church of England : to transact all things peace- “ ably and gently : to be helpful to each other : “ to use themselves to holy thoughts on coming in “ and going out : to examine themselves every “ night : to give every one his due : to obey su- “ periors, both spiritual and temporal.”* They were restrained by the rules of their association from discouraging at their meetings on any controverted point of divinity, or on the government of church or state ; and prohibited from the use of any prayers, but those, of the church, such as the litany and collects, and others prescribed to them, and particularly from the use of such, as the absolution, which were appropriate to the use of ministers. In the choice of books of practical divinity, which they read to one another, they were to follow the direction of the presiding minister.* These societies consisted chiefly of young men. After the Revolution they became more numerous ; and so improved

* Dr. Horneck’s Life, p. 14—16.

their finances by collections, that they were enabled to remunerate the attendance of many clergymen to read prayers : these aids to devotion were in a short time afforded at so many different hours, and extended to so many places, as to include every hour of the day. On every Lord's day there were constant sacraments in many churches. Greater numbers attended at prayers and sacraments, and greater appearances of devotion were diffused through the city, than had been observed in the memory of man.*

They soon began to carry their views beyond their own religious improvement to the state of morals around them : and they entered into an agreement to watch the public manners, and to inform the magistrates of swearers, drunkards, and profaners of the Lord's day, and disorderly houses. In the year 1692 arose out of these communities the institution of " Societies for the Reformation of " Manners." From some magistrates they met with support and encouragement ; by others they were treated roughly. The dissenters from the first entered into their virtuous views, and afforded them ready assistance. A part of the fines given by law to informers was thrown into a stock, which formed a charitable fund. They persisted in their well meant exertions, and extended their efforts to suppress vice and profaneness ; and were sanctioned by the solemn and public approbation of the lords temporal and spiritual, and of the judges on their cir-

* Burnet's History, vol. v. p. 90, 91.

cuits ; and their measures were occasionally recommended by the bishops in circular letters. In consequence of the representation of one of the secretaries of state, his Majesty William III. was induced to promise the societies his protection and countenance ; and at the solicitation of the House of Commons, in an address presented to him in 1699, he published a proclamation against profaneness and immorality, gave a royal sanction to the objects proposed by these societies, and invigorated their zeal and ardour in the prosecution of them. The ministers of religion were engaged to exhibit the importance and utility of their design, and to animate them in their endeavours to accomplish it, by sermons, addressed on stated seasons in the pulpit of Bow church to the members of the establishment, and in that of Salters' hall to the dissenters.* Ministers of the different denominations of the dissenters took their turns to plead the cause of virtue and a reformation of manners, and continued these services in succession for at least nearly fifty years.

Similar societies were soon afterwards formed in Ireland and Scotland ; and in about twelve years thirteen societies instituted for the same object existed in Edinburgh only, besides those which had been established in other parts of the kingdom under the auspices of the nobility, and of the commissioners of the general assembly of the church of Scotland. Other christian states in a

* Burnet, p. 91 ; Calamy, vol. i. p. 551 ; and an Account of the Progress of Reformation of Manners, 1705, 4to. p. 2.

public manner applauded and recommended the institution. The plan and success of the undertaking, by the translation of the "Account of the Societies" into the Latin, French, and Dutch languages, were communicated to other nations, excited great attention, and gave birth to similar associations. This account was printed and dispersed, and the design of it promoted, at Neufchâtel, by the exertions of the learned and excellent Ostervald. It was translated, printed, and much enquired after at Zurich; numerous copies of it were bought up and circulated in other protestant cantons; and the synods and consistories recommended the plan and measures of the English societies to be adopted in those districts. The principal persons in church and state united to bless God for the success with which the zeal of these religious communities had been crowned. They were had in veneration; and remembered and prayed for in all the pulpits. All the Helvetic and Rhetic churches were excited by this ardour to direct their efforts to the punishment of vice, and to promote the spread of christian knowledge and piety. The narrative of their proceedings was translated into the Danish and Swedish languages, with the view of introducing similar institutions into those kingdoms; versions of it in the German language were given and published with great effect by Monsieur Scherer, and Dr. Frank, of the city of Halle. The spirit it awakened produced good effects in Flanders, Holland, and Berlin.

The influence of the institution was not confined to Europe. Its operations became known, and were felt, in the West-Indies and North-America. In November 1700, a society for the reformation of manners, consisting of the clergy and many gentlemen of the country, was formed in the island of Jamaica. An impression of the "Account of the Societies" was printed off and dispersed through North America; and in 1702, and afterwards, several societies for the suppression of vice and profaneness were formed in Boston.

The fame of the English societies united in the prosecution of this laudable object, it appears by these instances, was spread into many lands: and "their example was followed in foreign parts," whence they often received letters, written by men "of the highest character, extolling the public spirit " of the nation, and praying for the ALMIGHTY'S " blessing on it." "Within a few years," said Dr. afterwards Bishop, White Kennet, in the anniversary sermon, Dec. 11, 1701, "by the working of this public spirit, a multitude of sinners have " been reformed, and to appearance at least have " been reformed. By a moderate calculation, no " less than thirty thousand persons have been con- " victed for profane swearing and cursing; nearly " the same number of lewd and disorderly persons " have been brought to a merciful punishment, and " were hereby reclaimed from their vices, or at " least restrained from the public scandal of them."

The efforts of the society to discountenance and suppress vice were not confined to the infliction of punishment. This often could not be done to the extent to which their virtuous zeal prompted them to carry it, without detecting the haunts of vice and employing informers; a measure at least invidious, and calculated to indulge evil passions in some, while it animadverted on the overt acts of others. A measure more judicious, and accompanied with no mischief or obloquy, was to disseminate moral and religious principles, and to address the reason and consciences of men, by the distribution of books of a religious nature, containing dissuaves from the vices of the age. Dr. Kennet, when he advocated the views of the society, observed that above one hundred thousand tracts of this tendency had been given away. The happy effect of these different endeavours was, that immorality and profaneness had visibly decreased. Among other tracts, which the society dispersed through England in vast numbers, was a small treatise entitled “The kind Caution to profane Swearers.” “The Soldier’s Monitor” was another tract, many thousands of which they distributed; and by the order of Queen Anne, it was given to her soldiers in Ireland, Flanders, and Portugal. The King of Prussia, on reading it, used it as a “vade mecum,” declaring that he had weighed it with great consideration; and commanded an impression of it to be distributed through his whole army at his own expence. It was translated into the Muscovite language; and application

was made to the Queen of Portugal, as well as to the Czarish Emperor, to distribute it through their respective armies. The example of the society in London was followed by those in New England. They circulated through every town of the province treatises to enforce the observance of the Lord's day, and a sheet of "Considerations" to reclaim those who neglected public worship. They compiled and dispersed an "Abstract of Laws" against all punishable wickedness. They endeavoured also to introduce a sense of religion among the sailors, and to bring them under better regulations than had been generally observed. A society for the suppression of disorderly conduct at Boston printed and sent through the colonies a sheet, stating the methods and motives for such associations. The consequence was, that they were established with much success and salutary effect in many towns; and letters were received from various quarters, reporting with gratitude and rapture the advantages of which they had been productive. While the design of these societies was accompanied with signal efficacy, it was carried on with great modesty, discretion, and silence. It may be feared, that the measures of the society in London, at least as far as relates to the apprehension of delinquents, were not uniformly conducted with equal care and temper; for the history of the institution furnishes two instances, in which the lives of the constables were sacrificed in the execution of their office. In May 1702, at May-Fair, the civil officers, under the di-

rection of the justices of the county, endeavouring to prevent the immoralities of the season, were assaulted by a company of soldiers, to the number of above thirty, with swords in their hands, and execrations and oaths upon their lips. Some were wounded; and one constable, Mr. John Cooper, was killed. The person by whose hands he lost his life, one Thomas Cook, a common fencer, was convicted of the murder, and executed for it; and William Wallis, a serjeant of the guards, was condemned as concerned in it. In March 1708—9, Mr. Dent, who, in the course of seventeen years, had aided the apprehending and prosecuting of several thousands of drunkards, swearers, and profligate characters, fell a victim to his zeal in the service of the society by the hands of three private soldiers. It was an honourable testimony to the virtues of his character, as well as to the activity of his efforts in the cause of reformation, and of the ardour of the society in the prosecution of their object, that his funeral was attended with great expressions of respect; between 20 and 30 clergymen preceded the corpse; twelve justices of the peace held up the pall, or immediately followed it; gentlemen of quality, aldermen, and above a thousand citizens, formed the train of mourners; and a guard of more than thirty constables and beadles accompanied the procession.*

* The Account, p. 10—14; Dr. Bray's Sermon at the funeral of Mr. Dent, dedication, and p. 25, 26.

These events served as lessons of prudence and caution to the agents who were engaged to promote the views of the reformers ; but did not furnish a reason for desisting from the prosecution of the great object, which was the suppression of vice, and the encouragement of virtue and good morals. This was an end beneficial to the community, and honourable to those who were engaged in advancing it. The principle on which they acted in unison was, that public combinations in virtue are necessary to balance and counterpoise those of vice. But as the most excellent designs under the management of men are liable to censure and abuse, from the influence of the errors, prejudices, and passions, which blend with or obstruct their execution ; it was to be expected, that this association in the support of virtue would incur censure, and meet with opposition, especially from those against whose pursuits and practices it militated. Resentment and revenge were in some instances, instead of reformation, produced in the minds of those whose vices were detected, restrained, and punished. And though it was not only recommended but insisted on by the members of those societies, that the informer should never receive that part of the penalty which the law allowed them ; though the practices of such unprincipled persons as extorted money from delinquents were detested, strictly enquired after, and when discovered, punished ; yet it was sometimes insinuated against the institution, and even charged on those who conducted it, that not refor-

mation, but procuring money from the offenders, was intended. Notwithstanding, however, the impediments and obstructions thrown in the way of the proceedings of the reformers by the refractory, and the odium cast on them by the resentful, these associations were in many instances efficient and successful, and actually produced much good. Many houses, the haunts of vice, were shut up. The streets were very much cleared of the loose and debauched. Many young men were brought to shame, and stopped in the career of vice and ruin. Many who were at first exasperated by the check which they received, were led to a sense of their sin and danger, recovered to a virtuous course, and became thankful for the means of their reformation. The total number of prosecutions in or near London only, for debauchery and profaneness, in the space of forty-two years was calculated at 100,650.* These prosecutions could not fail, by an immediate efficacy, to restrain vice; and besides the consequences which would be felt by the delinquents, would prove a warning to others, awaken in men a regard to their interest and good name, and excite a detestation of profaneness and vice.

Another institution arose among the members of the national church at this period, which went not to correct and punish the existing vices of the times, but to prevent iniquity by implanting the principles of religion and virtue in the minds of men, especially

* Bishop Maddox's Sermon to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, 17th Jan. 1736, p. 25—32.

in those of childhood and youth. This was the *Society for promoting Christian Knowledge*; to which the latter end of the year 1698 gave birth. "It breathed," it has been well observed, "the true spirit of christianity, and followed at a humble distance the example of its divine author, by diffusing the light of the gospel more especially among the poor."†

The means it adopted to secure its benevolent and rational ends were worthy of enlightened and liberal minds. These were the erection of charity schools, and the distribution of books. It originated with a few gentlemen, who entered into the design with an unanimity and zeal that secured its success. The society consisted partly of *subscribing*, and partly of *corresponding* members. The former at its first establishment lived in or near London, and were hence, till 1727, called *residing* members, who held regular meetings for the transaction of business; the latter were persons in Great-Britain, Ireland, and other protestant countries, who were chosen, on recommendation, to correspond with the *residing* members; to transmit to them an account of the state of religion in their neighbourhood; to suggest hints on the most promising methods to be pursued to answer its views, to remit occasional benefactions, and to receive from it for distribution bibles, testaments, and religious tracts.

Under the auspices of this society, and other generous friends to religion and to the rising generation, charity schools were erected, not in the

† Porteus's Works, vol. iii. p. 301.

metropolis only, but in all parts of the kingdom ; in which children, taken from the most indigent and helpless classes of society, were initiated into such learning as would qualify them for some ordinary employment ; taught the principles of religion and sound morals ; and clothed, and placed out in life. The least success in the prosecution of such useful measures is a great and useful effect. The institution has, with increasing influence, preserved its energy for more than a century. The area under the dome of St. Paul's Cathedral, in the year 1782, exhibited the wonderfully pleasing and affecting spectacle of nearly five thousand children, collected together from the charity schools in and about London and Westminster, and ranged in a kind of amphitheatre, as witnesses to the exertions of the society. The number of children then present was reckoned to bear a small proportion to the whole number in the schools of Great-Britain and Ireland ; which, it was calculated, exceeded forty thousand.

It was another principal object of this society to provide and to disperse, at a very considerable expence, among the lower people of all ages and occupations, a very large number of bibles, common-prayer books, and small tracts on a variety of religious subjects. The number which had been distributed by it, from its first institution thirty years since, was so immensely great as almost to exceed belief. Within fifty years preceding this date, it had amounted to no less than 2,834,371. "Inconsiderable and trivial," it has been well

observed, “as the little treatises dispersed by the
 “society may seem; yet it is by the repeated
 “efforts of such small instruments as these, that the
 “greatest effects are often produced. Their num-
 “bers, their plainness, and their cheapness, will give
 “them an efficacy and extent of circulation, which
 “much more voluminous and more laboured com-
 “positions may not be able to acquire; just as we
 “see that the lowest, and humblest, and most nu-
 “merous bodies of men, not the opulent and
 “splendid few, are those that constitute the real
 “strength and wealth of the community.” The
 wisdom and utility of this method of addressing the
 mass of mankind have been discerned and confessed
 by those who are not friends to revelation. Voltaire
 wrote innumerable little pieces against revelation;
 he prided himself greatly in having discovered this
 method, as he stated it, of *enlightening* the world;
 M. d’Alembert and others applauded his conduct
 in this respect.* Count Struensee, in one of the
 conversations which he had with the divine who
 attended him before his execution, expressed an
 earnest wish that the rational friends of christianity
 would learn this method, by which Voltaire had
 done much mischief, and apply it to better purposes,
 by writing small pamphlets to acquaint people with
 the advantages of christianity, which might be of
 greater efficacy than preaching.†

* Porteus’s Works, vol. iii. p. 307, note; 309, note, and 310.

† Wendeborne’s Narrative of the Conversion &c. of Count Struensee, p. 150.

The society of which we are speaking had been anticipated by the dissenters in one measure, by which they generously pursued the end of their association, viz. that of opening charity schools. In 1687, in the reign of King James II. Mr. Poulton, a jesuit, gave public notice that he would instruct the children of the poor gratis; and on this plan opened a school in Gravel-lane, Southwark, one of the poorest neighbourhoods in the city, where a great proportion of the inhabitants were watermen and fishermen of the lowest class. The proposal was deemed insidious, as it was also popular; and this person, under the appearance of compassion and liberality to the poor, was considered as artfully adopting a scheme to disseminate the principles of popery, and to make converts to it from the rising generation. Three respectable gentlemen, members of the congregation of the protestant dissenters, under the ministry of Mr. Nathaniel Vincent, Mr. Arthur Shallet, Mr. Samuel Warburton, and Mr. Ferdinando Holland, alarmed at the obvious design, and animated by zeal for protestantism, exerted themselves to counteract the operation of the jesuit's measure, by the foundation of a school for the instruction of the poor in reading, writing, arithmetic, and the principles of the protestant religion, to be supported by voluntary subscriptions, donations, and legacies, and by two annual collections. This was the first school opened by protestant dissenters; and it reflects lasting honour on its founders, that it was set up on truly liberal principles;

namely, that "objects should be received into it
"without distinction of parties, the general good
"being intended." The number of scholars at first
was forty; it afterwards was increased to fifty, and
in 1794 it amounted to an hundred and eighty.
One of the annual sermons was preached for some
years at the school on a new-year's day; but from
January 1, 1741,* it was delivered from the pulpit
in St. Thomas's, Southwark; and for more than a
hundred years was regularly printed and published.
The other was preached in the city.

It does credit to the protestant dissenters of the
day, that when the Society for promoting Christian
Knowledge opened charity schools for the instruction
of poor children, many of them concurred with
the members of that association in their benevolent
measure, and gave their names as subscribers to the
seminaries, formed on the principles of the estab-
lished church; till these seminaries became nurseries
of disaffection to the government, and strong pre-
judices against the dissenters were instilled into the
indiscriminating minds of the children. After the
accession of George the First to the throne, the
protestant succession remained doubtful, and no mea-
sure was left untried to defeat it. They who were
governed by these views, endeavoured to get the
management of the charity schools into their own
hands; and to convert the education of children, on
public funds, into an instrument of aversion and

* Dr. Allen's Sermon for the Charity School, in Gravel-lane,
Southwark, Jan. 1, 1741. p. 30.

disaffection to the protestant settlement.* This conduct was so notorious, and furnished so just and weighty a ground of complaint in those times against these institutions; that Dr. Wake, the archbishop of Canterbury, addressed a letter, in 1716, to the trustees of the schools in and about London, earnestly exhorting them “vigorously to animadvert upon
“all, whether children or teachers, who themselves
“appeared, or suffered others to appear, at any time
“in public to affront the government, and to bear
“a part in the tumults and riots, which were then
“a scandal as well as prejudice to the good order
“and peace of the realm.” In this letter his Grace also directed, that any catechisms or institutes taught in any of the schools, that meddled with political or party principles, should be immediately thrown aside, as pernicious to the original design of those pious nurseries. This prelate was so apprehensive of the consequences of this abuse of a charitable institution into a subserviency to party and political designs, that he some time after recommended it to the trustees to require all the masters and mistresses under their direction not only to take the oaths to the government before their admission, but at the time of their admission to subscribe to some such solemn promise or declaration as this,—“that they do heartily ac-
“knowledge his Majesty King George to be the only
“lawful and rightful king of these realms; and will

* Dr. Gibson, the Bishop of London's Directions for the Charity Schools, quoted by Dr. Watts, in “An Essay towards the Encouragement of Charity Schools, p. 45.

“ to the utmost of their power educate the children
“ committed to their charge in a true sense of their
“ duty to him as such : That they will not, by any
“ words or actions, do any thing whereby to lessen
“ their esteem of, or their obedience to, the present
“ government : That upon all public days, when
“ their children may be likely to appear among any
“ disorderly persons, they will do their best to keep
“ them in; and severely punish them, if they should
“ hear of their running into any tumults or public
“ meetings, contrary to the good order of such
“ schools and scholars.” His Grace’s advice was
adopted, and strengthened by the like exhortations
of other prelates in their sermons at the anniversary
meetings of the charity schools ; and the society
employed all their influence to secure a general con-
formity to the sentiments and injunctions of the
bishops in this matter, as of the last importance to
the welfare of their schools.*

These facts are proofs of the disaffection towards
the existing government, which in a great degree
characterized the times, and shewed itself in the
established church ; and they afford an affecting
example, that institutions formed at first on principles
of philanthropy, and the design of which is to ad-
vance knowledge and virtue, may be and have been
perverted from their original end, and prostituted
to party politics. When Bishop Gibson published
his directions some years after, he thought there

* Dr. Tucker, dean of Gloucester’s Sermon at Christ-Church,
7th May, 1766, p. 66 ; 67, of the Appendix.

was great reason to believe that much of that leaven was worked out; and was willing to hope that since things were better, true and loyal subjects would begin to think more favourably of those seminaries.* But in the year 1728, this leaven still continued to work. The divine right of episcopacy, and the invalidity of all ordinances administered by persons not ordained by regular successors of the Apostles, were taught in those schools, and instilled into the minds of children of six and seven years of age; and yet the contributions of dissenters were solicited to the support of these seminaries. Though the zeal of the managers might in such applications be conspicuous, the propriety and modesty of their suit may be questioned.† In fact displeasure was naturally felt, when it appeared that the subscriptions of dissenters were employed to support schools in which principles of disloyalty were taught; a bigoted zeal for the word *church* instilled into young and passive minds; and a spirit of enmity and persecution against all whom they were instructed to call *presbyterians*, was cherished in the hearts of children who were in part receiving their bread and clothing from the hands of those whom they were trained up to hate. The dissenters expressed their disapprobation of the illiberality of this conduct; withdrew their charity which was so abused; and from respect to their own principles, and a regard to their personal security, were stimulated to institute schools on a

* Watts's Essay, p. 45.

† Dr. Chandler's Sermon, at Gravel-lane, Southwark, 1st Jan. 1728.

more christian and generous plan ; in which, on the one hand, the children were taught nothing of the divine right of presbytery, and on the other, no suspicions of the scriptural authority of diocesan episcopacy were insinuated. In their seminaries the children were not prejudiced against any party of christians, nor were they bred up bigots to their own sect ; and the catechetical system of religious principles, into which they were initiated contained no articles but such as the established clergy subscribed, and their belief of which they were bound by Act of Parliament to profess. It will fall within a future period of this history to specify the schools formed in subsequent times.

The next measure adopted by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge was formed on a more liberal scale, and animated by a diffusive spirit of philanthropy. It extended its views and its aids to neighbouring and remote countries; communicating to them religious knowledge, by the distribution of books in their respective languages, and by the establishment of schools and missions, particularly in various parts of the East-Indies, for the conversion and instruction of the heathens. Such have been the progress and effects of their exertions, that a late venerable prelate, in the year 1782, from a retrospect of their proceedings, was enabled to give a pleasing view of the various results of their comprehensive designs. The society had printed and dispersed over the Isle of Man many thousand copies of the Old and New

Testament, of the Common Prayer, and other religious books in the vulgar language of that island. It had published three several editions of the Bible in the Welsh language, and distributed them through every part of Wales, to the amount of fifty thousand copies. It had made provision for the education of youth and the celebration of divine worship in the Scilly islands, where there was the utmost need of both. It had printed the New Testament and Psalter in Arabic; and had sent a large number of both, not to mention some other tracts, into Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Egypt, from its regard to the Greek church, and even into Persia and India. And it had dispersed many religious tracts in the Malabar language.*

It is an agreeable transition from this general account of the benevolent operations of this society, to notice another institution, to which the period passing under our review gave birth; the immediate and direct object of which was to plant christianity in foreign parts. The way had been prepared for such a noble design by the occurrences of former years. The pattern had been furnished in America, and the government at home had given its aid and sanction to it. The puritans, whom intolerance in religion, and political measures of a despotical aspect, had driven over the Atlantic Ocean to cultivate the wilderness of the western continent, no sooner saw the colony, raised in the dreary wilds of this new region, begin to flourish, but they applied them-

* Porteus's Works, vol. iii. p. 306.

selves with zeal and assiduity to effect the conversion of the Indians, and not without success. *Mayhew*, *Sheppard*, and *Elliot*, the last of whom in particular gained the honourable title of *the Apostle of the Indians*, distinguished themselves in these labours of sacred humanity. The savages were civilized, instructed, and formed into regular congregations. The success of these pious attempts drew the attention of the people and parliament of England. In 1646, “a Society or Company, for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, and the parts adjacent in America,” was constituted under the sanction of an Act of Parliament; and by a collection made in all the parishes in England, there was raised a sum sufficient to purchase an estate in land, of between 5 and 600l. per annum. Upon the restoration of Charles II. the corporation became dead in law; and Colonel Bedingfield, a Roman Catholic, who had sold an estate of 322l. per annum, which was invested in it as trustees, availed himself of the circumstance to re-possess himself of it, refusing at the same time to refund the purchase money. The Hon. Robert Boyle employed his interest with Lord Chancellor Clarendon to counteract this injustice. Mr. Baxter, and Henry Aithurst, esq; also joined their influence to obtain a re-establishment of the society under royal patronage; and by a new charter, granted by Charles II. in the fourteenth year of his reign, in the year 1663 it was incorporated, and the estate, which had been detained by

Bedingfield, was restored by a decree of the Chancellor ; and Mr. Boyle was appointed the first governor of the revived corporation.* These steps towards the spread of christianity were preparatory to a new institution, formed under the authority of the royal charter by King William, in 1701, entitled "The Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts." "It was," observes Bishop Burnet, "a glorious conclusion of a reign that was begun with preserving our religion, thus to create a corporation for propagating it to the remoter parts of the earth, and among infidels."† The design of extending into distant countries the blessings of the gospel received by this institution stability ; the royal patronage awakened activity and zeal ; the bishops and clergy gave it their generous and active support ; and its funds, were enlarged and strengthened by liberal subscriptions. The primary and immediate object was "the maintenance of a learned and orthodox clergy," to discharge the clerical functions in those plantation, or colonies, where either very scanty or no provision was made for the public worship of God. Another and early object of its attention was to provide, by catechists and schoolmasters, for the instruction and conversion of the negroes in the colonies. And their plan included, as their revenues increased, the civilization and conversion of the Mohawks; and

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 241; Birch's Life of Boyle, p. 141; and the Appendix No. 1. is a copy of the charter.

† Burnet's History, vol. v. p. 92.

other Indian nations. One of the first steps adopted by the society was to send, at the expense of its funds, fifty-four missionaries through the states of Georgia, North and South Carolina, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New England, and New York; to whom were added two catechists for the instruction of the negroes.||

In connection with the exertions of this society to disseminate christian knowledge abroad may be properly noticed the provision made by a private and generous individual to vindicate and defend the truth of christianity through future time at home. The great christian philosopher, the Hon. Mr. Robert Boyle, who during his life had given 300*l.* to advance the design of propagating the christian religion in America, by a codicil annexed to his will, dated July 28, 1691, charged his messuage or dwelling-house in St. Michael's, Crooked-lane, London, with the payment of the clear yearly rents and profits to some learned divine in London, or within the bills of mortality; to be elected for a term not exceeding three years, by Dr. Tenison, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, by Sir Henry Ashurst, Sir John Rotheram, and John Evelyn, esq; and the survivors or survivor of them, and such person or persons as the survivor of them should appoint to succeed in the trust. The office assigned to the lecturer was to preach eight sermons in the year for proving the christian religion against noto-

† Jablonski Institut. Christian. Histor. vol. iii. p. 32; Bishop Newton's Biog. Works, vol. iii. p. 422—425.

rious infidels, viz. atheists, pagans, Jews, and Mahometans ; not descending lower to any controversies that are among christians. In union with, and in subserviency to, the primary object of the foundation, the lecturer was enjoined to assist and encourage any societies engaged in measures for propagating the gospel in foreign parts ; and to be ready to satisfy real scruples, and to answer any new objections and difficulties, which had not previously received good answers. The sermons it was directed should be preached on the first Monday of January, February, March, April, and May, and of September, October, and November. The lectures were seldom continued above a year.

The endowment was liable to defalcation, or at least to delay in payment, or to difficulty of recovery, by the house standing empty, or tenants failing in due payment of the rent. To remedy these inconveniences, Archbishop Tenison procured a yearly grant of 50*l.* to be paid quarterly for ever, charged upon a farm in the parish of Brill, in the county of Bucks. This stipend is accordingly paid without fee or reward. “ The pious and honourable task of
“ preaching the Boylean lecture,” observes Mosheim,
“ has been committed always to men of the most
“ eminent genius and abilities; and is still undertaken
“ with zeal, and performed with remarkable dignity
“ and success. The discourses that have been
“ delivered in consequence of this admirable institu-
“ tion have been most commonly published; and
“ they form, at this day, a large and important

“ collection, which is known throughout all Europe,
 “ and has done eminent service to the cause of
 “ religion and virtue.”*

This institution has given occasion for the publication of some most judicious, learned, and popular works; to which an extensive circulation and a permanent celebrity have been attached. The first of these lectures was preached by that great scholar Dr. Bentley; whose sermons on this occasion have been pronounced the most valuable of that great critic's performances.† The design which he pursued in them was to demonstrate the being and providence of God on the principles of Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries. Among the hearers were the members of a club of sceptics or infidels; who, on being asked what they had to say against them, candidly owned that they did not know what to say.§ In

* Birch's Life of Boyle, p. 292,—3, and p. 353—4.

* Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 243. † Whiston's Memoirs, p. 93.

§ Dr. Bentley was so affected with this answer, Mr. Whiston tells us, as to say, “ he doubted he had done harm to Christianity
 “ by these sermons, as having diverted these sceptics from their
 “ denial of a God and a Providence, from which they might be
 “ always driven with great ease, to pick up objections against reve-
 “ lation in general: a mode of attack, which would certainly afford
 “ them a much larger field for contradiction.”* But surely the learned preacher had no just ground for this sentiment of concern and regret. He had fixed upon a subject peculiarly proper as the preliminary basis for a series of discourses in defence of natural as well as of revealed religion; on a subject that fell directly within the intentions and directions of the founder of the lecture. And there would be no security against blaming ourselves, if men were to be dissatisfied with themselves, because malignity and prejudice could and did pervert their good intentions and laudable exertions,

* Whiston's Memoirs, p. 93.

the succession of more than a century the lecture has been preached by some who have ranked with the first class of divines, and whose names are enrolled with honour in the annals of the republic of literature. To this lecture we are indebted for Derham's *Physico-Theology*; for Dr. John Clarke's *Sermons on the Origin of Evil*, which have passed through several editions; for Dr. Samuel Clarke's "Discourse concerning the Being and Attributes of God, the Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation:" [the sermons which form this treatise were executed in a manner that at once surprised and instructed the most intelligent hearers; "every christian in this country, in which they first saw the light, ought to esteem them," says Bishop Hoadly," as *his treatise*; as they contain the true strength, not only of natural, but revealed, religion:"] and for the course of sermons by Dr. Benjamin Ibbott, a most able, rational, and judicious defender of revelation; in which is accurately and liberally stated the true notion of the exercise of private judgment or free-thinking in matters of religion; the objections against it are answered; and the modern way of free-thinking, as treated of in a late discourse on that subject, is taken into consideration. The "Discourse on Free-Thinking," here

The preacher might have reflected, to his comfort, that he had left a large field open to his successors in the institution, in which he had not precluded them from labouring with skill, energy, and success through many years; and that he had laid a good foundation on which they might build.

referred to, was written by Anthony Collins, esq. It has been observed by a very able judge, Dr. Law the bishop of Carlisle, much to the credit of these discourses, that Dr. Ibbot stands absolutely clear of all the exceptions urged in “Christianity not founded on argument ;” and that he hath fully answered the end of the great and good founder of the lecture.* In this lecture originated also some important and valuable works, thrown, after they were preached, out of the form of sermons, which have excited great attention, and been justly held in high estimation. To this class belongs “The History of the Acts of the Holy Apostles confirmed from other authors ; and considered as full evidence of the Truth of Christianity ; with a Prefatory Discourse upon the Nature of that Evidence ;” by Rich. Biscoe, A. M. ; who had, in the earlier part of his life, been the minister of a congregation of dissenters at Newington-Green, till he conformed in 1727. Dr. Doddridge pronounces this to be an elaborate and valuable work. It has long been scarce. An appointment to preach the Boylean lecture gave rise to the learned Dr. Jortin’s admirable “Remarks on Ecclesiastical History ;” in the three first volumes of which is inserted the substance of the second and third heads of his discourses on that occasion. His subjects were, the nature and intent of prophecy, together with an examination of some predictions in the Old and New Testament ; and considerations on miracles in general, on the miracles of Christ and

* Considerations on the Theory of Religion, p. 24, 6th edition.

his apostles, and on the support which they gave to the christian religion.* By the trustees of this noble donation of the christian philosopher, Dr. Newton, afterwards bishop of Bristol, who had already published a volume of “Dissertations on the Prophecies,” was encouraged to proceed in his interesting and important investigations as to their design and accomplishment. He was invited to preach Mr. Boyle’s lecture: this testimony of approbation bestowed on his former work afforded an occasion, and acted as a stimulus to animate him, to pursue this particular study. The result was the publication of two more volumes of “Dissertations on the Prophecies which have remarkably been fulfilled, and “at this time are fulfilling in the world;” 1758. At the first impression 1250 copies were printed, and a thousand at every edition to the sixth in 1782. The work met with a very favourable reception abroad, and was translated into the Danish and German languages;|| and is still popular. In 1739, the discourses which had been delivered previously to that date at Mr. Boyle’s lecture were republished in a collected form in three volumes folio. In 1737, the Rev. Gilbert Burnet had given to the public a judicious, comprehensive, and well-digested *abridgement* of the sermons of those who had preached it before that time. This abridgement comprehends the discourses of Bentley, Kidder, Williams, Gastrel, Harris, Bradford, Blackhall, Stanhope, Clarke,

* Disney’s *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Jortin*, p. 54.

|| Bishop Newton’s *Posthumous Works*, Life, p. 73, 4.

Hancock, Whiston, Turner, Butler, Woodward, Derham, Ibbot, Long, J. Clarke, Gurdon, Burnet, and Berriman. This work was translated into the French and German languages ; at once a proof of the celebrity of the institution, a testimony of its merit, and the means of extending its influence. Some of the subjects discussed in these discourses have been already specified. As to the other sermons, those of Bishop Kidder bore the title of “ A “ Demonstration of the Messiah.” Those of Bishop Williams exhibited “ a general Idea of Revealed “ Religion.” “ The Certainty and Necessity of “ Divine Religion” in general was argued by Bishop Gastrell. Dr. Harris considered and refuted the objections of atheists to the existence and attributes of God. The credibility of the christian religion was stated by Bishop Bradford. The sufficiency and perfection of the revelation of the Old and New Testament were represented by Bishop Blackhall. Dr. Stanhope defended the truth and excellence of the christian religion against Jews, infidels, and heretics. The general plan of natural and revealed religion was the subject treated by Dr. Hancock. Mr. Whiston confined himself to the accomplishment of the prophecies of scripture. Dr. Turner shewed the wisdom of God in the redemption of the human race. Dr. John Butler, prebendary of Canterbury, chose for his topic “ Religion no matter of shame or injury.” The heavenly origin and incomparable excellence of the christian religion was set forth by Dr. Woodward. The design

of Bishop Leng was to prove the natural obligation to believe in the principles of religion and of divine revelation. Mr. Gurdon, the archdeacon of Sudbury, aimed to prove that the difficulties which men found in natural and revealed religion formed no excuse for infidelity. Dr. Thos. Burnet, rector of West Kington, Wilts, and prebendary of Sarum, entitled his sermons “a Demonstration of the True Religion.” Dr. William Berriman selected for his subject the gradual revelation of the gospel. This abridgement of the Boylean lectures was accompanied with a full and well-arranged table of contents.* To the names of those divines already mentioned, who since these publications have kept up the reputation and perpetuated the usefulness of this institution, should be added, Dr. Leonard Twells, Dr. Robert Warren, Dr. Ralph Heathcote, Dr. William Worthington, and Dr. Henry Owen. “In general,” it has been judiciously observed, “that though among such a
“number of writers, their reasoning will not in
“every respect and on every subject be alike im-
“portant and convincing, the sermons at Boyle’s
“lecture have done eminent service to the cause of
“natural and revealed religion, and constitute a
“system of evidence which no subtlety or sophistry
“can overturn.”† It is also a pleasing and animating reflection, which offers itself on the history of useful and philanthropic institutions, such as that of Mr. Boyle’s foundation, that when a man pro-

* *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, tom. xix. p. 449.

|| Dr. Kippis in *Biog. Brit.* article *Boyle*, p. 515.

vides for the execution of such a design, the good effects of it, both as to duration and extent, will very probably reach much beyond any calculation of its influence which he could make when he formed his plan.

We cannot conclude this chapter on useful institutions, without making honourable and particular mention of one clergyman, to whom the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge owed peculiar obligations. The divine here meant was the Rev. Dr. Thomas Bray; who was born in 1656, at Marton in Shropshire, and entered of Hertford college, Oxford. He was first, after taking orders, curate near Bridgenorth in Shropshire; he had afterwards the donative of Lac-Marfin in Warwickshire, the grant of Sir Thomas Price, of Park hall; his next preferment was the vicarage of Over-Whitacre, given to him by Lord Digby; who, in 1693, presented him to the rectory of Sheldon, both in the same county: this preferment he held till about a quarter of a year before his death, when he resigned it on the grounds of his advanced age, and the known worth and abilities of his appointed successor. He was also minister of Aldgate in London. This benevolent man, whose life was a series of public-spirited and generous exertions, in 1697, on the failure of his designs and endeavours to procure a publick fund to be established for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts, formed a design of having a protestant congregation, *pro fide propaganda*, by charters from the king. The circumstances of the

times not favouring this intention, he laid it aside. But to prepare the way for a charter-society, he endeavoured to find out worthy persons disposed to form a voluntary society to propagate christian knowledge at home and abroad. He communicated his views and scheme to Dr. Henry Compton, bishop of London, in 1697 ; and a society was formed on his plan, of which we have given an account : and the event was, as we have seen, when their numbers increased, and new benefactions improved their finances, the erection of a corporation under his Majesty's letters patent, May 5, 1701, for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts : so important, so extensively useful, often are the benevolent schemes and exertions of one individual. " Charity " to the souls of men," it is said by his biographer, " was wrought up to the highest pitch in his own " soul." Most of the religious societies and good designs in London, at that period, owe great acknowledgements to the memory of Dr. Bray, and were in a great measure formed on the plans which he projected. These benevolent undertakings furnished a source of consolatory reflections and of joyful presages in his last minutes. He died on the 15th of February, 1730, in the 73d year of his age.

CHAPTER V.

A CONCISE REVIEW OF THEOLOGICAL
PUBLICATIONS.

THE Reformation originated in a spirit of enquiry. Wickliffe and his followers, in particular, gave a manly example of asserting the independence of the human mind, and of daring to think and act for themselves. The policy and ambition of princes and statesmen had, in subsequent periods, great influence in promoting the secession from the church of Rome; but as far as the Reformation was espoused from conviction, it owed its advancement to examination and discussion. The secession from the first protestant establishments in different kingdoms proceeded from, and was supported by, men's presuming to think for themselves; and by tracing back the existing sentiments and practices into the foundation and authority which they had in the scriptures. The invention of printing gave a great facility to enquiry. As new events arose; as points of opinion and practice, the authority and rectitude of which had for ages been admitted, became doubtful and suspected; new dis-

cussions took place. Many in vindication of their adherence to established forms and creeds, and many in defence of their departure from them, were constrained to have recourse to investigation and argument. The Act of Toleration, limited as were its provisions, and narrow as was its spirit, gave encouragement to enquiry, and in a great degree removed the obstacles to the discovery and profession of truth. The Revolution itself called for the aid of the pen to advocate its necessity, justice, and importance: and the defence of it involved a vindication of men's religious as well as civil rights; of christian liberty as well as of the political constitution of these nations.

Accordingly the Revolution gave rise to many publications. At the commencement of it there came from the press, "The Way to Peace among all Protestants;" being a letter of reconciliation sent by Bishop Ridley to Bishop Hooper, with some animadversions on it. Another tract printed about this time was "A Memorial of God's last twenty-nine years' Wonders in England, for its Preservation and Deliverance from Popery and Slavery." There was also published, "The absolute Necessity of standing vigorously by the present Government; or a View of what both Churchmen and Dissenters must expect, if by their unhappy divisions, power and tyranny should return again." A third piece professed to exhibit a retrospective "short view of the methods made use of in Ireland for the subversion and destruction of the Protestant religion and interest in that kingdom, from the beginning of the reign of

“ the late King James to the present time ; and of
“ the sufferings of the Protestants all along.” Another tract was designed to expose “ the mystery of
“ iniquity working in the dividing of Protestants,
“ in order to the subverting of religion and our laws,
“ for almost the space of thirty years last past, plainly
“ laid open ; to which is added, a specimen of a bill
“ for uniting Protestants.” An examination of the
scruples of those who refuse to take the oaths of
allegiance :—King William or King Lewis ; or the
inevitable necessity these nations lie under of sub-
mitting wholly to one or other of these kings :—
Reflections upon the opinions of some modern
divines concerning the nature of government in
general, and of England in particular, with Magna
Charta annexed ;—were, as their titles indicate, tracts
properly suited to the circumstances and temper of
the day ; and calculated to excite discussion and exami-
nation of general principles of theology and policy.
There appeared many other publications of the like
nature, the most considerable of which are preserved
in “ The Collection of State Tracts,” on occasion of
the Revolution in 1688, vol. i.*

But one tract, mentioned before, which made its
appearance at this period, from the seasonable im-
portance of it, from the name of the author, from
its internal excellence, its influence on public opi-
nion, and its permanent fame, deserves particular
notice. This was Mr. Locke’s “ First Letter on
“ Toleration.” He composed it at the time, when

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 483.

having fallen under a suspicion of being an accomplice of the Duke of Monmouth, he took shelter in the house of Mr. Veen, a gentleman of Amsterdam, in 1685. It was first written in Latin, and printed at Gouda, in Holland, 1689, and entitled, “*Epistola de Tolerantia ad clarissimum Virum T. A. R. P. T. O. L. A. scripta a P. A. P. O. I. L. A.*” The first initials signifying, *Theologiæ apud Remonstrantes Professore, Tyrannidis Osore Limburgium Amstelodamensem*: and the latter series, *Pacis Amico, Persecutionis Osore, Johanne Lockio Anglo*. This excellent performance soon excited attention. It was translated, as we have before noticed, into Dutch and French in the same year; and two editions of it in English, the one in quarto, and the other in duodecimo, were published in London. To these impressions was prefixed an address to the reader by Mr. Popple, in happy imitation of Mr. Locke’s force and strength of expression. The writer aims to excite the reader to consider “the usefulness and importance of the work, and the great necessity there was, at that time, for both governors and people to attend to and profit by it.” Referring to the events of party struggles, then recent in the memories of men, and complaining with great justice of the narrow principles on which each party had asserted and vindicated their own exemption from penal statutes in religion; he adds, in strain of strong remonstrance, for which in every period since, and even in the present day, it is to be lamented, too just occasion is afforded, “this nar-

“rowness of spirit has undoubtedly been the principal occasion of our miseries and confusions. But whatever has been the occasion, it is now high time to seek for a thorough cure. We have need of more generous remedies than what have yet been made use of in our distemper. It is neither ‘Declarations of Indulgence, nor Acts of Comprehension,’ such as have yet been practised or projected amongst us, that can do the work. The first will but palliate, the second increase, our evil. *Absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty, is the thing we stand in need of.* Now, though this has indeed been much talked of, I doubt it has not been much understood; I am sure not at all practised either by our governors towards the people in general, or by any dissenting parties of the people towards one another.”

A Second Letter on Toleration, in answer to Jonas Proast, chaplain of All-Souls’ college, Oxford, who had written against the first, appeared from the pen of Mr. Locke in 1690. A Third Letter on Toleration, in answer to some new objections, was published in 1692, written with great strength and accuracy. The controversy slept for twelve years; when his first opponent Mr. Proast revived it. Mr. Locke began to compose a fourth letter on the subject; but died before he had finished it. What he had written was printed in his posthumous works in 1706. Celebrity has been attached to the first of these letters on toleration. The subsequent letters in defence of it, though they be exceedingly valu-

able, it has been observed, “ carry in them that
“ air of controversy which may have made the
“ whole less minded by common readers.”

In 1764, Thomas Hollis, esq; the munificent friend of science and literature, and the ardent advocate of civil and religious liberty, bestowed incredible pains in promoting a new edition of the “ Letters concerning Toleration ;” and engaged Mr. Baron to correct the press. This edition was published Jan. 1st, 1765. Mr. Hollis himself collated the first letter with the first 4to. and 12mo. editions in 1689 ; and Mr. Baron wrote the preface.

It is remarkable that this first letter, notwithstanding the honour it has secured to the name of the author, was never printed by itself, though this neglect is not much to the credit of Englishmen, if we except a second edition in 1690, till 1800, when a neat impression of it appeared from the press at the expence of his Grace the late Duke of Grafton, with an advertisement prefixed to it by Mr. Lindsey ; who, with too great propriety, says, “ It is mortifying to observe that a work of such an
“ author, and of such inestimable price, should have
“ been more than a century before the public, and
“ have produced so little of the effect which might
“ in all reason have been expected from it ; and that
“ the original address should apply equally to the
“ nation now as at the first.”*

* The edition in 1800, advertisement, p. 4 ; Hollis's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 224, 332, 263 ; Le Clerc's Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. Locke, p. 23, 24, 31 ; British Biography, vol. vii. p. 10, 11,

Mr. Locke, it has been observed, and truly with respect to the fact, was not the first writer on the subject; for the argument had been well understood and stated during the civil war. But the critical time in which this work appeared, so soon after the passing of the Act of Toleration, and the eminence and known abilities of a living author, drew the attention of the public to it. In the preceding reign the ill policy of excluding from civil privileges a considerable number of protestants, who were barriers against popery and arbitrary power, had been felt by some even of the great churchmen themselves, as by Archbishop Sancroft. But Mr. Locke's treatise, though it was professedly, according to the title, a Plea for Toleration only, as was presently perceived, had a more extensive bearing. It was a leading design of it to ascertain exactly the distinction and bounds between the business of civil government and that of religion; and to prove that the whole jurisdiction of the civil magistrate reached to civil concerns only, to guard and secure the enjoyment of them to every individual: and that it neither can nor ought, in any manner, to be extended to the salvation of souls; a care which is not committed to him any more than to others, and to which he is not competent. Another point which the author discusses is the nature of a church, which he shews to be a voluntary society of men

13; and Calamy, vol. i. p. 499—506, 523—527, 699, in which the author has given an abstract of the principles and reasonings contained in the letters.

formed into an union for the public worship of God; which ought to be tolerated by the magistrate, but over which he has no power, either to constitute, to model, or to govern it. His arguments and reasonings were grounded on comprehensive principles, applicable to the defence of all parties in all countries; and calculated to evince the right of all good subjects, not only to be exempted and secured from all penalties on account of their religious opinions, but without distinction to enjoy the same favour of the prince, and the same benefit of the laws.

The first effect of Mr. Locke's reasoning appeared in a very sensible protest in behalf of the rejected bill for abrogating the sacramental test in the year 1689.* It may justly affect thinking persons with surprise and deep concern, that the liberal reasonings of Mr. Locke have not yet had their full influence on the minds of men, and that they make so slow a progress; though the public attention, since that excellent work was written, has been repeatedly directed to the discussion of the questions relative to religious liberty. It is, indeed, a source of much satisfaction, a favourable omen of the advancement of truth, that the subject has never been agitated, especially in the legislative assemblies, without some triumph over intolerance, without gaining over new converts to the cause. It is still, however, ardently to be wished, that the pleas and arguments of Mr. Locke's work may have a repeated hearing, and a

* Archdeacon Blackburne's Works, vol. v. p. 98, 99.

more extensive, improving effect. Nay, admirable as was that treatise for the time in which it was written, it yet left the subject open to be discussed with more correct precision, and on a more enlarged basis. “It is an argument that we have made a very poor use of it, if we acquiesce in it at this day. It is certainly not adviseable to rest solely upon the authority of any man, as if his sentiments and maxims were the perfect and unalterable standard with respect to it, so as to abide by any conclusion that may be drawn from his doctrine.” The application which Dr. Brown* has made of Mr. Locke’s opinion,—that those are not all to be tolerated who deny the being of a God,—is a striking instance to the point; for he has availed himself of this principle to plead for intolerance in some other cases also. The magistrate might evade Mr. Locke’s great argument, founded on the distinction between civil and religious rights, by choosing to call that a *civil* which his subjects would term a *religious*, concern; because many things and rights are of a mixed nature.†

Among other publications, to which the Revolution and the measures of government gave occasion, was “A Letter to a Member of Parliament, shewing that a restraint on the press is inconsistent with

* Vicar of St Nicholas in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and author of *Essays on the Characteristics of Lord Shaftesbury*.

† Priestly’s *Letter of Advice to Dissenters*, on an application to Parliament for relief from certain Penal Laws, 1773, p. 88, 89, 84.

“ the protestant religion, and dangerous to the liberties of the nation ;” printed in 1698.*

The evils of restraining the press are fully represented in this tract, and the point is argued with great ability. It is urged, that restraints on the press tend to produce a blind submission to the religious principles in which men chance to have been educated ; deprive them of the most proper means of coming to the truth, by hindering their examination of different opinions and arguments ; obstruct that influence of truth which arises from an examination of its evidences, convincing the understanding and endearing the discovery of it ; and are a bar to all those important offices of love which consist in the mutual communication of our sentiments, and in assisting one another to detect error and arrive at the knowledge of truth, by offering one another reasons and arguments.

Ignorance, superstition, and bigotry, it is observed as a matter of fact, prevail and abound even in protestant as well as in popish countries, in proportion as these communications are discouraged and prevented. The Reformation, it is alleged, was built on the freedom of examination, aided by the press. An entire liberty of the press, it is insisted on, would by degrees establish religious truth, because that is supported by better, plainer, and more cogent arguments than are any false opinions. The excellence and usefulness of truth, it is urged,

* A Collection of State Papers published during the reign of William III. vol. ii. has preserved this piece; p. 624—625.

carry evidence and conviction with it. Every argument advanced to justify licensing books that profess to interpret the scriptures, it is pleaded, applies to defend the papists in restraining by licence the reading of the bible; and every reason offered to restrain advancing from the press opinions and arguments contrary to those established by the church in power, holds as strongly against their being proposed from the pulpit. The art of printing, it is remarked, has been a noble means employed by Providence to deliver men from the tyranny of the clergy; but to trust them with the power of licensing books is to deliver back into their hands the means of bringing on again a sacerdotal slavery; and to put the press into their hands is to give the power over it to those who are educated not to try the established religion, but to profess it; not to investigate the truth, but to earn their bread by what bears the name of it;—to those who are shackled with early oaths and subscriptions;—to those ~~who~~ who cannot any more be presumed to have impartially examined the tenets they find settled by law, than the mercenary soldiers do the justice of the cause in which they are engaged;—to those who are in all countries warm and active for the opinions to which their preferments are annexed;—to those who cannot but be highly displeased and affronted to see the laity do what they durst not, judge for themselves.

Restraining the press, it is added, if committed to the laity, would imply a disrespect of the clergy;

as not to be trusted with printing but half a sheet on religion without the consent of a lay-licenser, who is to have an arbitrary power over their works ; which would undoubtedly be highly resented by them. Restraining the liberty of the press, as it is unfriendly to our religious rights, is also inimical to our civil ones. There never was a nation who lost the former, that could retain the latter. Priestcraft and slavery go hand in hand. It deprives rational and social creatures of the greatest enjoyment of which they are capable ; that is, it forbids them to employ their thoughts on whatever subject they please, and to communicate them one to another as freely as they conceive them. It is the engine of slavery, to prevent the defect of either the government, or the management of the government, from being discovered or reformed ; an instrument in the hands of arbitrary power to bar true patriots from pleading the rights and liberties of the people, and to sanction the pen of those who argue for the extension of the prerogative. The liberty of the press secured, all other liberty is secure ; *that* denied, no other is preserved,

Restraining the press, it is further argued, discourages the ablest men from writing ; who will not be content to have their works lie at the mercy of an ignorant, or at the best an unlicensed licenser, who upon a cursory view may condemn the whole to perpetual darkness, or strike out the most material things. Thus, it concludes, the most important discoveries may be lost, and the most valuable works

be suppressed. It tends to leave the press open to none but fools and blockades, and to make an *imprimatur* to signify no more than that such a book is foolish enough to be printed.

These and many other arguments for the liberty of the press are placed, by this tract, in a strong point of view.

In 1704, Dr. Tyndal published "Reasons against restraining the Liberty of the Press;" frequently adopting, in a concise way, the language and arguments of this tract; and though not exhibiting a methodical abridgement of it, yet evidently formed on its principles. These "Reasons" were republished by Mr. Baron, in the "Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy," in 1768, vol. iv, p. 281.

There also appeared at a critical moment, when the Act of Parliament for restraining the liberty of the press, and permitting nothing to be published without the *imprimatur* of a licenser, was just expiring, a nervous pamphlet, entitled "A just Vindication of Learning, and of the Liberty of the Press," by Chas. Blount, esq. This gentleman, younger son of Sir Henry Blount, was a zealous friend to the Revolution, and to the liberal principles on which the defence of that interesting event was founded. This tract is digested into nine sections; each offers a distinct argument against the invasion of that liberty, which the author justly states is at once the foundation and security of every other kind of liberty; namely, the power of speaking and publishing the truth with respect to persons, measures, and subjects

of investigation : let this freedom be possessed, the other liberties of a people are in a great measure safe.

These generous efforts to claim and vindicate the freedom of publishing had a good effect. The pernicious act was suffered to expire, and the press was set free.*

The subject had been discussed with singular energy and eloquence by Milton, in his "Arcopagitica," written against the Presbyterians, who had contended for the freedom of the press, when it was under the controul of the episcopal church ; but rising afterwards into power, they turned apostates to their own principles, and abusing their ascendancy in Parliament, procured an order to be published, June 13, 1643, for restraining the press, and placing " this formidable engine under the same control, of which they had lately indignantly complained."† But, notwithstanding the excellence and authority of Milton's work, the subsequent restraints on the press, the great object of the Revolution, namely, the security and extension of liberty, and the particular tenor of the Act of Toleration, rendered the publication of the other tracts now reviewed seasonable and pointed. And though licensers and imprimaturs have been, since that period, confined to Oxford ; yet repeated attempts made to restrain it, and frequent prosecutions of authors and publishers, in subsequent and recent times, evince the propriety and even necessity of often recalling the

* British Biography, vol. v. p. 196.

† Dr. Symonds's Life of Milton, p. 213, edit. 1806.

public attention to the equity, policy, and wisdom of watching the insidious designs, or resisting the more open attacks of Ministers of State against the liberty of the press. It should be also considered, whether the arguments which apply against preventing, do not hold good against punishing, the publications of opinions, that, with or without reason, may be thought pernicious?

Dr. Johnson, speaking of Milton's "*Arcopagitica*," says, "The danger of such unbounded liberty, (of unlicensed printing) and the danger of bounding it, have produced a problem in the science of government, which *human understanding* seems unable to solve." "Let us then have recourse," replies a judicious writer to a *divine understanding* for the solution of it: "Let both the tares and the wheat grow together till the harvest, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them."*

These publications immediately arose from the political events and occurrences of the day, and were connected with them. But the spirit of enquiry did not confine itself to topics of this tenor; it also shewed itself on many questions purely theological. The way for such investigations had been prepared by the controversies which had arisen in preceding times. It would be foreign to the design of these pages to detail them. But one publication, which made its appearance thirteen years before the Revolution, was, considering the genius of the age, of

* *Memoirs of Thomas Hollis, esq;* vol. ii. p. 551.

so singular a kind, created so much notice, and called forth so much opposition, that though the extent and permanence of its influence on the public mind cannot be ascertained, it deserves to be mentioned ; especially as it has had the credit given to it,* of mollifying, when it was first published, “ the “ spirits of some men that were set upon persecution “ of the Dissenters ;” and it was re-printed and preserved in a collection of scarce and valuable tracts, called “ The Phoenix,” 8vo. No. xxx. It was entitled a “ Treatise on Human Reason.” It is a small work in 14mo. first printed in 1675. The author was *Martin Clifford, esq*; master of the Charter-House ; educated in Westminster school, and thence elected into Trinity College, Cambridge, a man of talent, and a polite scholar, who lived in great intimacy with most of the wits of Charles II’d’s reign. An idea may be formed of the nature and design of this tract from the following passages : “ He bids you search ; there is therefore “ in man a natural ability of searching spiritual “ truths, and that can be nothing else but his understanding : he who gave rules which admit of “ so many interpretations, is well contented that

* By Dr. Watts, see Dr. Johnson’s Life of Dr. Watts, with notes, 1785. In this publication are given, in the Appendix No. 1. some strictures of that excellent man on the “ Treatise of Human “ Reason,” as a specimen of the Doctor’s manner of reading. N.B. The writer of this recollects, that when he was a youth, receiving his classical learning at St. Paul’s School, the Rev. Mr. Allen, an assistant master in that seminary, and the learned Editor of Demosthenes, passed a commendation on Mr. Clifford’s treatise.

“ they shall be interpreted severally : we lay the
“ blasphemous accusation of injustice upon God,
“ if he punish us for an error which we could not
“ avoid : reason is the eye, true religion is the ob-
“ ject : all other helps, divine and human, are as
“ the light, as spectacles, &c. Now it is impossible
“ to see with any thing but our own eyes, *i. e.* our
“ reason. Yet a clear light is necessary, without
“ which our own eye cannot see the object, nor our
“ reason find out the true religion.” The author,
it appears, was the advocate of enquiry, candour,
and freedom. His book was attacked by a scholar
at Cambridge, in a tract tending towards perfec-
tion, entitled “ Plain Dealing.” It was defended in
a tract, called “ An Apology for the Discourse of
“ Human Reason, &c.” 12mo. by Albertus Warren.
It also drew from the pen of an anonymous writer,
“ Observations, &c.” charging the author with
confusion and inconsistencies. But the most marked
testimony to the attention which it had excited, and
to the alarm which some had taken at it, was the
answer of Dr. B. Laney, bishop of Ely ; who,
dining with many persons of quality in the Charter-
House, soon after its publication, on being asked
what he thought of the book, replied, “ It was no
“ matter if all the copies were burnt, and the author
“ with them.”* Dr. Watts, in a spirit worthy of
himself, passed a more candid opinion on it, “ as
“ having many useful notions ;” “ though,” he adds,

* Wood’s *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. p. 381—2 ; and Gran-
ger’s “ *Biographical History of England*,” vol. iv. p. 96.

“ it exalts reason as the rule of religion, as well as
“ the guide, to a degree very dangerous.”

The controversies which had been agitated in the preceding reigns, on the questions that relate to the constitution, discipline, and worship of the christian church, between the members of the English established church, the presbyterians, the independents, and the baptists, excited the attention of a young gentleman,† strongly bent on learning and theological enquiries, then an apprentice to his father, a grocer, in Exeter; and engaged him, by a diligent examination of the authentic writings of the three first centuries, to investigate the usages of the antient church within that period. The result of his enquiries into the matter of fact on these points appeared in a work published in 1691, the 22d year of the author’s age, entitled, “ An Enquiry into the Constitution, “ Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive “ Church, that flourished within the first three “ hundred years after Christ; faithfully collected “ out of the extant writings of those ages; in two “ parts.” The strict exactness and care with which this treatise is drawn up; and the learning which it displays, have justly secured to it great reputation, and rendered it a standard book of authority to this day. In 1717, Mr. Sclater, a nonjuring clergyman, attempted to undermine its authority by an answer to it, entitled, “ An original Draft of the “ Primitive Church,” 8vo. But this work has long since sunk into oblivion. The author of the

† Mr. Peter King, afterwards Lord Chancellor.

“Enquiry” assures the public, that by the trouble and affliction which the animosities and quarrels of the day occasioned him, he was induced to make his researches, and publish the result of them ; for, if he could be the happy instrument to compose and heal those quarrels, he was ready to sacrifice not only that book, but all that he was or had. These were the feelings of a tender, ingenuous, and youthful mind. Two reasons particularly swayed him ; namely, to inform others, and to inform himself. So far was he from aiming at applause, and seeking to gratify vanity, he so contrived to conceal his name, that his bookseller did not know it ; and throughout the work, he supported the character which he assumed in the title-page as his signature, that of “an Impartial Hand.”

Some of the questions considered in the preceding treatise were discussed about the same time, with learning and temper, in two posthumous works, by a man of uncommon erudition and abilities, and of singular modesty and humility, Mr. David Clarkson, who was ejected from Mortlake in Surrey, and had been the tutor of Archbishop Tillotson, at Clare Hall in Cambridge. These treatises were entitled, the one, “Primitive Episcopacy, stated and cleared from the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Records ;” the other, “A Discourse on Liturgies.” The subject of the former tract had in some measure passed under the author’s review, in a treatise published during his life in answer to Dr. Stillingfleet ; and which was the most noted of his works, and

“shews him,” says Mr. Granger, “to have been a
 “man of great reading in church history.” It was
 entitled “No Evidence of diocesan Episcopacy in
 “the primitive Times ;” 1681, 4to.*

In 1692, there appeared a work of celebrity, now
 scarce, from the pen of a learned and ingenious
 writer, who had already gained great reputation
 by a performance in Latin, on “the Sacred Theory
 “of the Earth.”† The work to which we allude,
 has a claim to our notice in this place, on account
 of its connection with sacred literature. It was
 composed in Latin, and was entitled “Archæologiæ
 “Philosophicæ; sive Doctrina Antiqua de Rerum
 “Originibus :” that is, an Enquiry into the
 Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning
 the Original of the World ; in two books. The
 second edition was printed in London, 1728, 8vo.
 It is addressed, in an elegant panegyrical dedication,
 to King William. The author was Dr. Thomas
 Burnet, master of the Charter-House, chaplain in
 ordinary and clerk of the closet to King William.
 “His design,” as it is stated in the preface, “is to
 “enquire into the opinions of the ancients concerning
 “the nature of things, in order to vindicate and
 “give antiquity its due praise; and to shew that
 “neither were our ancestors dunces, nor was wisdom
 “or true philosophy, born with us.” The subject

* See the Preface to the Treatise ; and for an analysis of the
 work, Calamy, v. i. p. 516—523.

† For an analysis of this work, or a short view of its design, see
 British Biography, vol. vii. p. 73—77.

of enquiry in this treatise is the state of the *old world*, or according to the Vulgate translation of 2 Pet. ii. 5, “the original world ;” that is, the antediluvian, but inclusive also of the flood itself, and its concomitants and immediate consequences. The first book offers a prospectus of the ancient philosophy through the various nations of the earth, the Scythians, Celts, and Æthiopians ; takes a survey of the oriental nations, including the philosophy and learning of the Chinese and the Brachmans, of the Assyrians and Chaldæans, of the Persians and their Magi, of the Arabs and Phoenicians, of the Hebrews and their Cabbala ; exhibits a view of the various literature of the Egyptians ; then passes over to Greece, and examines the philosophical principles, first of Orpheus, then of the Ionians, afterwards of Pythagoras and his sect ; in succession to him the principles of Eleatic sect, a school formed of philosophers, differing in country, manners, and tenets ; after them follows a review of the doctrine of the Stoics, Platonics, Aristotelians, and Epicureans. A discussion on the origin of the barbaric philosophy, or the philosophy prior to the Grecian, concludes the first book.

The second book is a kind of commentary on the scripture theory of the earth. The subjects discussed in it are the ancient universal tradition concerning the chaos ; the first form and external appearance of the earth, as distinguished from subsequent states of it ; the nature, manner, and causes of deluges, especially of the universal flood ; the perpendicular

position of the earth, with respect to the sun and its properties, as a perpetual spring or equinox, an atmosphere wet with rain, but no rainbow, and the longevity of mankind ; the change of its position into an oblique direction, and the consequent phenomena ; the Mosaic account of paradise, and of nature and man in the new world ; the origin of things as represented in the first chapter of Genesis, and the interpretation of the Mosaic Hexaëmeron, or the creation distributed into the works of six days ; the doubts and objections which may be urged against the author's explanation of the Hexaëmeron, by those who adhere to the literal sense of the word. The author, anticipating the offence and odium which his sentiments on the Mosaic narrative, and the first state of mankind, might and did raise, calls the attention of his readers, in the last chapter, to some considerations and testimonies of authors, which appeared to him of great moment to a fair and candid judgment of his opinions ; such as, the nature and genius of the oriental style ; the slow conception and narrow genius of the people of Israel, when the Mosaic narratives were written ; the opinions and comments of learned men, who had written before him on these points ; and the reverential regard to the Divine Being to be preserved in the interpretation of these passages, that a sense becoming his perfections and greatness may be affixed to them. In an appendix, the author gives a concise view of the doctrines of the modern Brachmans. This is followed by two letters to a learned friend,

who had represented to him the reflections cast on his work in vindication of it. But offence once conceived does not easily yield to calm remonstrance, nor does prejudice impartially weigh arguments. This Dr. Thomas Burnet experienced. In vain did he plead the modest and unassuming spirit in which he wrote : in vain did he appeal to the fervent and devout wishes, with respect to these points, as expressed at the conclusion of his treatise, that his errors might be pardoned from divine compassion towards human weakness and darkness, and that he might be enlightened, with clearer views : in vain did he urge that he had not written his sentiments in the vulgar tongue, to unsettle the minds of the illiterate, and to start some subjects of conversation in alehouses ; but he had composed his work in the Latin language, for the consideration of the learned, and of the ministers of religion. The influence of the clergy was excited against him. He was precluded from any other preferments in the church ; and the King was obliged even to remove him from his post at Court. The manner in which he represented the history of the Fall, with a view to shew in a strong light the difficulties which attend the literal sense ; the necessity of having recourse to a figurative interpretation, especially by casting into the form of a dialogue between Eve and the serpent the brief narrative of the temptation ; was the part* which gave peculiar offence. The author

* It may be considered as a proof of the more liberal spirit of our own times, and of the progress of free enquiry, since the days of

afterwards desired a Dutch bookseller to suppress this dialogue, in an edition of the work, then printing in Holland.† It is also omitted in the edition of 1733. And from the scarceness of the original work, it has been read by few persons in the present day.

In 1693, there appeared a critical work, formed on a more comprehensive plan than is compatible with the discussion of any particular theological question. It was professedly an investigation of the sense and grammatical construction of many passages of scripture, independently of any system. This was one of the first, if not the first, work of the kind after the Reformation. It proceeded from the pen of a layman of rank and title, whom the editor, for it was a posthumous publication, characterises as sincerely religious, and profoundly judicious, as well as learned. Its title is, "Annotations upon some difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament;" by Sir Norton Knatchbull, knight and baronet; Cambridge, 1693. It consists of original and select observations. It had been fairly transcribed, and prepared for the press by the author himself; and was a more complete and perfect draught, enriched with supplemental and new remarks, as well as a translation of a Latin work, which

Dr. Thomas Burnet, that different authors, Hartley, Price, and Bishop Newton, have maintained, without drawing an odium on themselves, that a figurative rather than a real serpent was intended, and that the narrative of the Fall is founded on hieroglyphical delineations, or is in great measure allegorical.

† Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 279.

had been thrice printed at Oxford ; and was offered to the public as a more useful, elaborate, and successful essay in its kind than had been before published. The design pursued by the author is to ascertain the proper sense and right use of each ambiguous particle, word, and phrase, which came under his scrutiny ; and to vindicate and elucidate, by a more plain and accurate version, and a more intelligible and appropriate exposition, the genuine construction of the intricate periods, obscure transitions, and perplexing trajections, in the passages on which he bestows his attention. This edition is introduced by the Latin preface of the former editions in that language. Benson and Doddridge have both referred to these “ Annotations,” with expressions of great respect ; though they have in the spirit of liberal criticism examined, and either adopted or discarded the author’s critiques, as that examination of them suggested. Sir Norton Knatchbull ranks in the list of principal critics on the New Testament affixed by Dr. Harwood to his edition of the Greek Testament, and by Archbishop Newcome to his “ Attempt for an improved Version of “ the New Testament.” It reflects credit on this work, and on the acumen and judgment of its author, that the celebrated Dr. Hammond, in the second edition of his Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament, availed himself of some of the notes, of which, at his request, Sir Norton Knatchbull had given him the sight in manuscript ; Sir Norton indeed was encouraged to pursue his critical

disquisitions, and to publish them, by Dr. Hammond. The learned Baronet, while he professed a great respect for ancient and modern expositors, yet often differed from both with a becoming and generous independence of mind, expressing his wish to be allowed, and his disposition to grant to others, liberty of opinion.

In the same year in which this critical work issued from the press, Mr. Tong, then a dissenting minister at Coventry, and afterwards at Salter's-hall in London, well known as the biographer of Mr. Matthew Henry, and eminent for his own character and talents as a minister, attracted the attention of the public by "a Vindication of Nonconformity." In 1689, Mr. M. Henry published a small "Discourse concerning the nature of Schism;" intended to clear the dissenters from the obloquy and odium under which they lay; as charged with that sin. The design was to examine the meaning of the word schism in all the places of scripture in which it is found, and to shew that it signifies uncharitableness and alienation of affection among christians; and the conclusion drawn from the enquiry is, that there may be schism where there is no separate communion, and that a separate communion may exist without schism. This tract was given to the public at the persuasion of Mr. Tong. It called forth singular and illiberal animadversions. Mr. Tong took up his pen in defence of Mr. Henry's "Brief Enquiry into the nature of Schism, and the Vindication of it; with Reflections upon a pamphlet

“called the Review; and a brief Historical Account
“of Nonconformity from the Reformation to this
“present time.” 4to. || The nature of catholic unity,
a term tortured on the one hand to frighten the weak
and timorous, and on the other to reproach the
opposers of spiritual usurpation and tyranny, was
the principal subject discussed in this tract. The
author considered it in two views; either as political,
in the union of all sincere christians, by faith in one
God and one Mediator, unto Christ their head; or
as moral, in mutual love towards one another; from
which principles arises the conclusion, that none are
out of the unity of the church but those who are
destitute of these fundamental graces. To affirm
this of protestant dissenters in general, and merely on
the ground of their dissent, the author looked upon
as “a piece of diabolism which the gospel abhors,
“and of which humanity itself will be ashamed.”
The remainder of the treatise was designed to clear
the nonconformists from the different charges of dis-
obedience to superiors, and of indecorum and irregu-
larity as to religious ceremonies and worship, in their
expressions, gesture, and habit. The vindication of
the nonconformists against the first charge turned on
three pleas, viz. that bishops had no power distinct
from or superior to that of presbyters by the law
of God; that the whole jurisdiction of English
bishops, and the authority of the canons, was derived
from the civil magistrate and the laws of the land;
and that the civil power had left the nonconformists,

|| Tong's Life of Matthew Henry, 12mo. 1716, p. 282.

at that period, to their liberty in the case of conformity, and that therefore no charge of disobedience to authority lay against them. The nature and rule of decorum or decency, as connected with any ceremonies of religion, some reflections on parish order, the terms of conformity, the reasons of nonconformity, and the arguments produced for the imposition of ceremonies, were the points considered in reply to the second charge. The nature of schism and other matters came under review ; and the historical appendix, though short, is represented to have been “ clear and strong.” †

An anonymous churchman at this time had the candour and liberality to take up his pen in the cause of the dissenters, and to plead, by many very affecting and earnest considerations, for such abatements in matters relative to the ceremonial part of worship, as might obviate the scruples of some at least, and gain them over to the established church, and prevent the secession of others. He particularly recommended, among other alterations, that the surplice and habits, the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the LORD’s supper, should be dropt or left indifferent. He proposed a review of the form and method of the liturgy, as partaking much, in its present state, of the Romish stamp ; and wished the length of it to be considered. He suggested the propriety of an alteration of the Athanasian Creed, that “ the gate of heaven might not “ be made narrower than God had made it ;” and

† Calamy, vol. i. p. 530, 531, 532.

recommended such an order and direction of church music as would prevent men's mistaking the tickling of the ears for an elation of mind and heavenly rapture. The title of this treatise was "A Plea for Abatement in matters of Conformity to several Injunctions and Orders of the Church of England. By Irenæus Junior, a conforming Member of the Church of England." 4to. Some of the expostulations of the author, quoted by Dr. Calamy, are proofs of the spirit of the times, while they express his own just and generous resentment at it. He urged, "that if many earnest and repeated promises of persons in extremity could lay an obligation of performance upon them, to pay their vows whenever they became solvent, there were many, of no small figure or interest in the church, under no mean tie to find out an expedient and temper to heal those breaches which several controverted rites and ceremonies in the church had unhappily occasioned." He reminded the public, "that some, who in the height of the storm promised a candle as tall as their main-mast, when that was allayed, thought one burnt into the socket too costly a sacrifice to offer up for the peace and unity of the church." The author delineated another feature of the times in the complaint which he brought forward; that "whereas non-resistance and passive obedience had been the universal cry of the church, and squeezed till the blood came; the mischief was, when they had nursed the prerogative till it had stung some of them, and hissed at all the rest, they

“presently let the world see they never brewed this
 “doctrine for their own drinking. Then,” he
 added, “they acknowledged we suffer justly; but
 “what have our brethren done whom we pursued
 “with such revenge and rage? Then they confessed
 “they sacrificed the interest of the church to their
 “malice; but if the dissenters would forbear to
 “comply with the common enemy, they would do
 “great things for them whenever they came again
 “into their kingdom. But alas! there is too much
 “reason,” he subjoined, “to cry out,

“Ægrotat dæmon, monachus tunc esse volebat;

“Convaluit dæmon, dæmon ut ante fuit.”

“Witness that great regret some of them have
 “expressed against that kindness and favour which
 “the king and two succeeding parliaments have
 “evinced to dissenting protestants, while they with
 “fury bite the chain which restrains them from
 “falling foul on their former prey; besides their
 “unreasonable stickle to prevent the least abate-
 “ment in matters which respect the ceremonial
 “part of worship, a conformity to which goes
 “with them for the whole duty of a minister.”*

The publications of the period which have been noticed, related to points of difference between those who were equally attached to revelation as a rule of faith, worship, and discipline; and who made their appeal to the scriptures as an authoritative and divine rule. These discussions tended to open the mind, to stimulate enquiry, to exercise sagacity, and

† Calamy, vol. i. p. 532—535.

to strengthen the judgment. But whilst christians, the professed advocates of revelation, were contending amongst themselves on doctrines and ceremonies, the times were not destitute of writers, whose publications tended, if they were not designed, to undermine the authority of the scriptures. Those publications naturally led men also to examine the grounds of their faith ; to elucidate the meaning and true sense of the scriptures in passages which appeared to furnish strong objections to their divine authority ; and to discriminate between the genuine doctrines of revelation, and the corruptions of christianity : an employment of the mind, which, after a long night of ignorance, superstition, and error, required patient enquiry, cool consideration, and length of time.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury, held in equal admiration for his person, understanding, learning, and courage, with a view to discard all extraordinary revelation as useless and unnecessary, though he made no attempt to refute the evidences of the Jewish and Christian revelations, asserted the sufficiency, universality, and absolute perfection of natural religion ; which he reduced to five articles, viz. that there is one supreme God ; that he is to be worshipped ; that piety and virtue are the principal parts of his worship : that sin, on repentance, will be forgiven ; and that there will be a future state of rewards for good, and of punishment for wicked men.*

* Leland's View of the Deistical Writers, vol. i. p. 3, 4, 8vo. ed. 1798.

About the time of Lord Herbert's death, Mr. Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, published several treatises, in which, though they were not directly levelled against revealed religion, he advanced principles subversive of all religion, by deriving it from "the fear of power invisible, feigned by the mind, " or imagined from tales publicly allowed;" and his system of ethics had a strong tendency to corrupt the public morals. "There was," it has been observed, "a great difference between Mr. Hobbes and " Lord Herbert. This noble writer considered the " belief of a future state among the common notions " naturally obvious to the minds of all men: but Mr. " Hobbes grounded it upon other men's saying, " that they knew it supernaturally, or that they " knew those who knew them that knew others " that knew it supernaturally."*

These writers were followed by Mr. Charles Blount, youngest son of Sir Henry Blount. This author gave offence to many by several publications, which were viewed as unfavourable to revealed religion. One was entitled, "Anima Mundi; or, " an Historical Narration of the Opinions of the " Ancients concerning Man's Soul after this Life, " according to unenlightened Nature." Another was "the two first books of Philostratus, concerning the " life of Apollonius Tyanæus, with philological " notes;" written with a design to oppose the character and miracles of the magician and philosopher to those of Christ. A third publication in 1683,

* Leland, ut ante, p. 35, 37, 38.

entitled "*Religio Laici*," was little more than a translation of Lord Herbert's treatise under the same name.

The work which more particularly solicits our notice as published in the period under our review, issued from the press in 1693, after the author's death, under the care of his friend Mr. Charles Gildon, afterwards distinguished as a dramatic writer, as its editor. This treatise consists of various small tracts, not very suitable either in subject or execution to the pompous title which it bore ;* nor all written by Mr. Blount. The first is a letter with his name to it, in vindication of Dr. Burnet's "*Archæologia*;" sixty-six pages out of 226 are occupied with a translation by H. B. of the 7th and 8th chapters of that learned work, with the appendix on the Brachman's religion ; which, as Dr. Leland observes, were very far from being intended to subvert the authority of the Mosaic writings, though they were designed to state, and to place in a strong point of view, the difficulties that attend a literal interpretation of many passages in them. The next short article, "a Summary Account of the "*Deist's Religion*, addressed to Dr. Sydenham," is to be considered in connection with another, under the form of a letter to Charles Blount, esq; with the signature of A. W. "on Natural Religion as opposed to Divine Revelation." The writer of these treatises advances the same general principles with Lord Herbert. He extends, however, the five

* The Oracles of Reason.

articles to seven, by defining the worship of God to consist in prayer and praise ; and by adding one article in asserting the government of the world by the providence of God ; and another, on our obedience to the rules of right reason, as constituting moral virtue. In the letter to Dr. Sydenham from Mr. Blount himself, prefixed to the first of these tracts, there is a remarkable concession. “Undoubtedly,” says he, “in our travels to the other world the common road is the safest ; and though deism is a good manuring for a man’s conscience, yet certainly if sowed with christianity it will produce a most profitable crop.”* The next tract written by Mr. Blount, and addressed to Mr. Hobbes, “as the great instructor of the most sensible part of mankind in the noble science of philosophy,” exhibits a short historical view of the Arians and Trinitarians, and of general councils, at the time when those sects divided the christian world. A short essay to elucidate the proposition, “that felicity consists generally in pleasure,” by Rd. Richardson ; another, “Of Beneficence and Gratitude,” signed Robert Yaxley ; and a third, “Of Fate and Fortune,” with the signature An. Rogers, follow each other. These are succeeded by a letter *to the right honourable* the most ingenious Strephon, “concerning the Immortality of the Soul ;” and by another letter “to the deservedly honoured and most ingenious Major A. concerning the original of the Jews ;” both written by Mr. Blount. He ap-

* Oracles of Reason, p. 195, and p. 37.

appears in the former a strong advocate for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, of the evidence of which he gives this general statement: “besides, my lord, “the authority of the holy scriptures, as also the “innumerable other arguments which may be deduced as well from philosophy as reason to prove “the immortality of the soul, together with its rewards and punishments, (though I determine not “their duration;) yet there is no argument of “greater weight with me than the absolute necessity and convenience that it should be so, as well “to complete the justice of God, as to perfect the “happiness of man, not only in this world, but in “that which is to come.”* In the other letter Mr. Blount betrays a want of frankness, and raises suspicions of his sincerity; for while it consists of a long translation from Tacitus, relative to the history of the Jews, and of appeals to Trogus and ancient Egyptian writers to invalidate the scripture narrative, and to fix a stigma on that people as banished out of Egypt for an epidemical scabies, he affects, at the conclusion, an implicit reverence of “the holy “scriptures, dictated, *as every good christian ought to “believe*, by the Holy Spirit, as the best and only “history on the subject to be relied on;” and professes to give his friend the other accounts only for the sake of gratifying curiosity, and to treat them as “only uncertain accounts of partial authors;” in evident repugnance to the general strain and spirit of this performance. The next essay discusses, with

* Oracles of Reason, p. 124.

learning and address, the question on the lawfulness of marrying, one after another, on the death of the first, two sisters. This was written to remove, but without success, the scruples of a lady, the sister of his wife, with whom, after his wife's death, he became enamoured. Two more letters to Strephon follow: one, in Latin, states the thoughts of his father, Sir Henry Blount, concerning the action of the soul on the body; and the other is a disquisition on the subversion of Judaism, the foundation of christianity, and the origin of the millenaries. The several sorts of augury as practised among the ancients come next under a cursory review. The regulations of corporations, and the surrenders of charters, in reference to some recent transactions, through a few following pages, are the objects of Mr. Blount's censure. The two subsequent essays, "Of a God," and "Of the Materiality of the Soul," were written by Mr. Gildon. The volume closes with a translation from Ocellus Lucanus, a Pythagorean philosopher, on the eternity of the world, by Mr. Blount's own pen. With the same general view to weaken the authority of the Mosaic account of the creation, there are dispersed through the work several pages together translated from the author of the Hypothesis of the Præ-Adamites; and an appeal is repeated in different places to the antiquity pretended to by the Chaldeans and Egyptians, and to records and histories set up by the Chinese, affecting a date four or six thousand years before the Mosaic age of the world. The author, who ad-

vanced the opinion of the existence of Præ-Adamites afterwards renounced the sentiment; and Dr. Stillingfleet, in his learned work, the *Origines Sacrae*, about thirty years before the publication of the “Oracles of Reason,” had considered and discussed the questions concerning the eternity of the world, and the pretensions of the Chinese and of some ancient nations to an antiquity so remote and prior to the Mosaic æra. But Mr. Blount is on these points perfectly silent, as if the sentiments which he was fond of advancing had never been controverted.†

“The Oracles of Reason” did not fail to provoke a reply to the insinuations which they contained against revelation. Mr. John Bradley animadverted upon them in a work, published in London, in 12mo. entitled, “An Impartial View of the Truth of Christianity, with the History of the Life and Miracles of Apollonius Tyanæus; to which are added, some Reflections on a book called Oracles of Reason.” Dr. Nicholls, a learned divine, fel-

† *Isaac Le Peyrere*, author of the two small treatises on the existence of Præ-Adamites, to reconcile his notion to the authority of the books of Moses, maintained that they were records of the origin of the Jewish nation, and not of the human race; and that Adam was the father of the Jews, not of mankind. His work was published at Brussels, 1655. Though a protestant, he was apprehended and cast into prison by the influence of the doctors of the catholic church, as broaching an error which they considered as striking at the foundation of revealed religion. To recover his liberty, if not to save his life, he publicly renounced his opinions. A recantation under such circumstances is suspicious; and the sincerity of it may be doubted. This may be regarded as an apology for Mr. Blount’s passing it over without notice.—*Lampe Epitome, Eccles. Histor. lib. ii. cap. xiv. §. 42. Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 394.*

low of Merton college, Oxford, and afterwards rector of Selsey in Suffex, in a work under the the form of "A Conference with a Theist," left no material part of the book unanswered. It is particularly worthy of notice, that Mr. Gildon, the editor and the particular friend of Mr. Blount, gave a striking proof, some years afterwards, that whatever deference he entertained for the sentiments of the author, when he brought his treatise before the public, he had not sacrificed his own judgement and principles on the altar of partial friendship. In 1705, he appeared from the press as the author of "The Deist's Manual," a valuable work, chiefly taken up in a vindication of the great principles of natural religion; because he found that they were either denied, or represented as doubtful and uncertain, by many deists in the circle of his acquaintance; and that their not admitting natural religion in its just extent gave occasion to some of their principal prejudices against the christian revelation.†

The "Oracles of Reason" can scarcely be mentioned, without reviving, in candid minds, a painful recollection of the state of its author; who, in a phrenzy brought on by the inflexible adherence of the lady whom he was so desirous of marrying, to her religious scruples, shot himself in the head; a catastrophe which humanity will deplore, but which the experience of life, and the particular circumstances of the case lead equity of judgment to consider as altogether independent on the sceptical

† Leland's View of the Deistical Writers, vol. i. p. 48,

principles of Mr. Blount. The cause of the phrenzy, which had so fatal an effect, suggested, it may be supposed to the editor of his posthumous work, to take up and pursue the question handled in one of the treatises comprised in it, namely, the lawfulness of marrying two sisters in succession, on the death of one. The discussion of this point occupies nearly half of Mr. Gildon's preface. The former part advocates every man's right to exercise and follow, without restraint by human authority, his own reason and understanding in religion, and in the interpretation of the scriptures. This is argued in defence of Dr. Burnet, a translation of two chapters of whose *archæologia*, as we have noticed, forms part of the "Oracles of Reason." With reference to which the author of the preface observes, "Let *reason* be our judge, and we can
" never fear being censured by it for establishing
" its sovereignty; nor can the nicest devotee that
" hath any deference to reason deny, but that Dr.
" Burnet has discovered more veneration for the
" great prophet Moses, by reducing him to that
" noble standard of freeing him from all the absur-
" dities which vulgar apprehensions have cast on
" him, than those who stickle them, that involved
" him in them. In short, it is not Moses but his
" interpreters, that the learned Doctor has exposed;
" and by consequence it is not that holy lawgiver,
" but the blind bigots of the old absurd interpreta-
" tion of him, that we have offended in publishing
" this in English." Mr. Blount's death is not re-

ferred to in this preface, nor does his name occur. He is only alluded to several times, as the writer's honoured and learned friend.*

This article has been extended to too great a length. To proceed : in the next year, 1694, the attention of the public was called to a work, which in a surprising manner turned the argument which the dissenters had strenuously urged against the established church, on themselves. It was written by a prelate of great abilities and learning, an active friend to the Revolution, Dr. William King, then bishop of Londonderry, afterwards archbishop of Ireland. His treatise was entitled, "A Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God." The parts of christian worship on which the author insisted, were praises, prayers, hearing, bodily worship, and the LORD's Supper. His design was to shew the agreement of the worship of the established church, in these instances, with the precepts and precedents of the Old and New Testament ;

* The above remark is made to correct a statement concerning the tenor and design of the preface, in two very respectable publications, viz. The Biographia Brittanica, and Goadby's British Biography, under the article of Blount. The former says, speaking of the "Oracles of Reason," "in the preface Mr. Gildon gives some account of our author, also defends Mr. Blount's manner of dying, and threatens to follow his example;" the latter informs its readers, that Mr. Gildon ushered it into the world with a preface "in defence of self-murder." On what authority these assertions are made the writer has no means of ascertaining ; but *this* he can affirm, that they have no foundation in the edition of the "Oracles of Reason" now before him, which was printed in London in 1693, and appears to have been the first, though it might not be the only impression of this work.

to convict the dissenters of departing from both, and acting on a plan of their own invention. He charged them with doing this, by not using whole psalms and responses, and by rejecting musical instruments, and singing the praises of God in metre only. He instanced also their rejection of forms of prayer, and not joining the minister with their voice. He urged against them that they did not read the scriptures in their public assemblies, or that the selection of the lessons from it was left to the choice of the minister. He charged them with disallowing bodily worship; and he alleged against them that they had no fixed times for the administration of the LORD's Supper.

Mr. Joseph Boyse, a dissenting minister in Dublin, eminent in point of character and abilities, repelled this attack in "Remarks on the performance of the Bishop;" who returned an answer under the title of "An Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants, &c. of the diocese of Derry, concerning a book lately published by Mr. J. B. entitled Remarks." To this Mr. Boyse replied in a "Vindication of the Remarks, &c." in 1695, 4to. The Bishop rejoined in the same year, in "A second Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants, &c." Here the controversy closed. The bishop was considered as misrepresenting the dissenters of his diocese by charges, which, if they had been just in themselves, did not apply to the body of dissenters in general, who were known to be free from several of the faults imputed to those

of Derry. The event of the controversy was, that the dissenters being better known to the world than to the bishop, incurred no loss of reputation by it; nor did his argument leave much impression, or reflect any great credit on his own community.*

About the same time that the dissenters were censured for introducing many human inventions into the worship of God, by the pen of a prelate in the sister kingdom, a learned writer of their own body, Mr. James Owen, of Shrewsbury, undertook to defend in this kingdom a principal instance of their discipline; and vindicated the office of a christian minister, as entered on among them, against the depreciating views in which episcopal claims placed it, in a treatise entitled, "A Plea for Scripture Ordination." This was written to prove the validity of ordination, by the laying on of the hands of presbyters without diocesan bishops, by ten arguments from scripture and antiquity. The author argued from this mode of ordination being admitted as valid in the primitive church, and being sanctioned by examples and precedents in the New Testament, Acts i. 2, 3, 1 Tim. iv. 14; from the identity of bishops and presbyters, on the authority of scripture, Acts xx. 17, 28, 1 Pet. v. 12, Phil. i. 1; and from the concession of the Church of England by the whole clergy in their provincial assembly 1537, as appears from "The Institution of a Christian Man," set forth to be preached to the whole kingdom, by the King and Parliament;

* British Biography, vol. vii. p. 327; Calamy, vol. i. p. 541, 542.

from the authority granted to presbyters, and exercised by them, to preach and to administer baptism and the LORD's Supper, acts not inferior to ordination; from the practice of the foreign reformed churches; from the practice of the Church of England itself, in which presbyters are not only allowed, but required to join with the bishop in the imposition of hands; and from the evident principle, that being in orders connects with it a power to confer orders.* It is obvious that the question concerning holy orders, and these arguments, proceed on this ground,—that ordination invests the ordained with an authority to exercise sacred functions; and is not merely a testimony of respect and friendship, but a commendation to the divine assistance and blessing.

This tract of Mr. Owen produced "Exceptions" to it from Mr. Thomas Gipps, rector of Bury in Lancashire; to which Mr. Owen replied in a "Defence" of his "Plea," in 1697.

In the year 1695, appeared from the press a production, of the first excellence as a specimen of didactic theology, and of the first importance as to its object, the christian religion itself, a subject of evident superiority to any question concerning discipline and ceremonies, or even the explanation of any particular doctrinal principle; and it was soon discovered to have proceeded from the first pen of the age, though it was anonymous, and the author

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 543; Dr. Charles Owen's Life of Mr. James Owen, p. 101—103.

carried the point of secrecy so far as to conceal his concern in it from his most intimate friends. This work was entitled, "The Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures." It excited much attention, as appears from a letter which its author, Mr. Locke, wrote to Mr. Molyneux at Dublin, desiring to know what people thought of it there: "for here," says he, "at its first coming out it was received with no indifferency, some speaking of it with great commendation, and most censuring it as a very bad book." His friend, in reply, informed him that a very learned and ingenious prelate said he liked it very well; and that if Mr. Locke writ it, it was the best book he ever laboured at. But," says he, "if I should be known to think so, I should have my lawn sleeves torn from my shoulders." Abroad it was greatly esteemed by two of the best divines who were then living, Le Clerc and Limborch. Le Clerc pronounced it one of the most excellent works on the subject that had for a long time appeared.† Limborch preferred it to all the systems of divinity he had ever read. Soon after its publication it was translated into French and Dutch. But we are informed it was extremely offensive to the corrupt and selfish part of the clergy, both high and low. Its doctrine, it seems, militated too strongly against the foundation of their favourite idols, power and interest, inasmuch as it teaches *salvation by Christ alone.*‡

* "Un des plus excellens ouvrages qui ait été fait depuis long-tems sur celle matiere et dans cette vue."

† See the preface to a late edition of this treatise in 1810. p. 12.

The principal design of this treatise is to shew, by a review of the Gospel and the Acts, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles required nothing of those to whom they preached, as the condition of their being baptized and acknowledged as converts, but faith in Jesus of Nazareth, as the Messiah ; for the belief of this article necessarily includes a readiness to be instructed in the history, doctrine, and commands of this heavenly king ; to receive the truths he taught, and to obey the precepts he delivered, when known and understood.

This principle the author illustrated and proved by a great number of passages ; but in the discussion of his main argument he was led to treat on several other points, which had not been handled by any writer before him. The first was, the reason why Jesus did not, from the beginning of his ministry, explicitly and openly declare himself to be the Messiah, but only by degrees opened his character, till when near his death, he avowed it without reserve. This caution was practised on account of the impatient expectation of a temporal Messiah, who would deliver them from a foreign yoke, having been entertained by the Jews, to prevent a seditious rising ; and to guard against his religion being considered as a political faction, instead of an heavenly doctrine.

Another point which, in connection with this, the author illustrates, is the reason which determined Christ to select for his disciples and attendants men of low rank, unlearned and unpractised in the wisdom and ways of the world. Men of higher birth, of

aspiring genius and enterprize, would have been less submissive to the restraints of caution and reserve; would hardly have been hindered from whispering, at least to their friends and relations, that their master was the Messiah; and would have been too ready to form schemes to announce him to the world, and to enlist numbers under his standard.

It is also a subject of enquiry discussed in this work, whether we are to seek in the epistles of the apostles other and new articles of faith, which are not taught in the gospels? The author answers in the negative, and supports his decision by many arguments which deserve to be well weighed. There are many who think with him that the holy spirit which the apostles received, did not instruct them in any new doctrines, but only enabled them better to understand and comprehend those which they had heard from the lips of their divine master.*

Several other topics are incidentally touched upon in this work, that claim the reader's attention; such as, the nature of justifying faith, the laws and requirements of the gospel, the final doom of those who lived before our Saviour's time, and of all the rest of mankind who never heard of him; and lastly, the advantages we have received by Jesus Christ. Under this last head the author takes a fine and comprehensive view of the excellence and superiority of a system of morals by revelation; in which he displays "a vast knowledge of human nature, an ex-

* *Bibliothèque Choisie, par Le Clerc, tom. ii. p. 288—292.*

“tensive acquaintance with antiquity, and a prodigious sagacity and penetration of mind.”†

Neither the candour of the author, nor the clearness and strength with which he treated his subjects of enquiry, could procure “The Reasonableness of Christianity” a fair hearing. It alarmed the advocates for the jargon of the schools and the established systems of theology. “He,” it is justly observed, “who has to combat with prejudices supported by bigotry and power, will find the task difficult. Some zealous hireling,” or blind adherent to systems, “will attack him with the venom of the serpent, misrepresent him, and answer what he has not written. Such treatment did Mr. Locke receive from Dr. Edwards, a divine of the Church of England, though the son of a furious presbyterian, the author of ‘The Gangnena,’ a curious picture of religious opinions and sects of his day.” Dr. Edwards stated various objections against Mr. Locke’s principles, in a desultory manner, encumbered with repetitions, in a language that was not merely low but scurrilous in the extreme; and not satisfied with the declarations and words of scriptures, as ambiguous and common to the orthodox and heretics, he blended with them the decisions of the father of schoolmen. Mr. Locke replied in two vindications of his work, in a masterly manner, and in language becoming the gentleman and the christian; and contrary to his antagonist’s manner of

† Benson’s Reasonableness of the Christian Religion, vol. ii. p. 322, 3d edition.

writing, preserved through the whole answer a pure respect and attachment both to the words and sentiments of the New Testament, scrupulously adhering to them in every instance.*

“The reasonableness of Christianity” found also an advocate in a worthy and pious clergyman, Mr. Samuel Bold, rector of Steeple in Dorsetshire; who, unconnected with its author, and unknown to him, and embracing the popular sentiments of the times concerning the deity of Christ, the doctrine of the Trinity, and other points, and who had before this suffered by a legal prosecution for preaching a sermon against persecution, stepped forward, with a firmness and laudable liberality of mind in the cause of free enquiry and moderation, in vindication of Mr. Locke’s performance, and in an answer to Dr. Edwards, and did not hesitate to pronounce it “one
“of the best books that had been published for at
“least sixteen hundred years.” Mr. Bold, on whose defence the learned Le Clerc passed an encomium, as being well and ably written, ingeniously observes,
“Were the ‘Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.’ ge-
“nerally read with deliberation, and rightly under-
“stood, and (what I apprehend to be) its main design
“well followed, it would be of eminent use, amongst
“other good purposes, to these two: first, to effect
“a happy alteration in particular persons; for if
“more time and pains were employed in bringing
“people to a sound conviction and full persuasion
“that *Jesus* is the *Christ* and *only saviour* of sinners,

* *Bibliothèque Choisie*, p. 304.

“and of their own personal need of him; and less
 “of each in squabbling about terms *men have de-*
 “*vised to express their own conceits*, relating to points
 “which Christ and his apostles have delivered in easy
 “and unaffected words, there would not be such
 “great numbers every where who pretend to be
 “christians, merely because it is the fashion and
 “mode of the country to make that profession;
 “but we might, upon good grounds, expect that
 “multitudes would be *christians* upon a *rational*
 “and *wise* choice.”*

Mr. Locke's work, while Dr. Edwards's *Reflec-*
tions on it have long since been forgotten, maintains
 its credit by its perspicuous reasoning and intrinsic
 merit to this day; and a neat and new edition of it
 was published, in 1810, by a Society for promoting
 Christian Knowledge and the practice of virtue.
 It has also a place in Dr. Watson's, bishop of Llan-
 daff, valuable “Collection of Theological Tracts.”

A work which we had occasion to notice as having
 fallen under the censure of the Convocation, and which
 from this circumstance, as well as from the celebrity
 of the author and the peculiar design of it, attracted
 much attention, namely, Bishop Burnet's “Exposi-
 “tion of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church
 “of England,” was not published till 1699; though
 it was drawn up in 1694. The author was first
 induced to undertake this task of giving a clear and
 full explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles by his

* See the preface to the edition of 1810; and *Memoirs of Mr.*
Bold, in the *Monthly Magazine* for September 1806, p. 150.

friend Archbishop Tillotson. His Grace's influence, it appears, was not sufficient to overcome the reluctance which Bishop Burnet felt at the proposal ; till the Archbishop engaged the Queen to unite her commands with his recommendation of the design. These commands were at first limited to the articles that seemed so entirely to lean to an absolute predestination, that some, upon that account, scrupled to subscribe them ; and the church was reproached with the conduct of its ministers, who were considered as going one way, while the articles looked another. This point appeared to require to be well cleared. But her Majesty's directions were afterwards extended to the whole thirty-nine articles.

“ The Exposition,” a performance the result of great abilities and indefatigable industry, was begun and finished in less than a year ; and sent to Archbishop Tillotson, who read it over with great pleasure, and an exactness peculiar to him ; corrected it with a care that descended to the smallest matters, and returned it with expressing his astonishment at the execution of so vast a work in so short a time. It was afterwards perused and approved by Archbishops Tenison and Sharp, Bishops Stillingfleet, Patrick, Lloyd, Hall, and Williams. The Queen and Archbishop Tillotson dying after the exposition was finished, some of his friends advised the author to postpone at least the publication, apprehending, as he himself did, that such a work would lay him open to many malicious attacks. The event, in the subsequent proceedings of the lower House of Con-

vocation against it, justified this opinion. He kept it by him five years ; at the end of this interval, after it had received new corrections from his revisals of it, he was prevailed on by the Archbishop Tenison, and many of his own order, to delay the publishing of it no longer. His episcopal rank, and the interest which his brethren took in the publication, give us the key to the opposition and discountenance which the attack made on it by the lower House of Convocation met with from the upper. The unassuming manner in which the author introduced his work, ought to have screened it from every malicious attack, as it recommended it to the attention of the candid. Modestly referring to the testimonies in its favour, with which not only his episcopal friends but many learned divines had returned the manuscript, after a careful perusal, he adds, “ yet after
“ all these approbations, and many repeated desires
“ to me to publish it, I do not pretend to impose
“ this upon the reader as the work of authority.
“ Even our most reverend metropolitans read it
“ only as private divines; without so severe a can-
“ vassing of all particulars, as must have been ex-
“ pected, if this had been intended to pass for an
“ authorised work under a public stamp. In what
“ I have done, I am, as to far the greatest part,
“ rather an historian and a collector of what others
“ have writ, than an author myself. This I have
“ performed faithfully, and I hope with some mea-
“ sure of diligence and exactness ; yet if in such a
“ variety some important matters are forgot, and

“ if others are mistaken, I am so far from reckoning
“ it an injury to have those discovered, that I will
“ gladly receive any advices of that kind ; I will
“ consider them carefully, and make the best use of
“ them I can, for the undeceiving of others, as soon
“ as I am convinced that I have misled them.”*

The object of the author in this work was to shew that the Articles, especially those on the predestinarian controversy, were capable of the several senses of different doctors ; and that an article being conceived in such general words that it can admit of different and grammatical senses, even when the senses given are plainly contrary one to another, they who affix different and repugnant senses to them, may each subscribe them with a good conscience, and without any equivocation. For the bishop was decidedly of opinion, that subscription imported an assent to the articles ; was a declaration of the subscriber's opinion, and not a bare obligation to silence ; and that the articles were a standard of doctrine, and not merely bonds of union and peace. But admitting that the articles may have different senses, and on this ground be subscribed without prevarication by those who put different constructions on them, the consequence would be that the necessity of abolishing subscription on part of the church was superseded. His lordship, after all, it has been observed by the author of the Confessional, had but a slender opinion of the effect of the expedient he adopted to bring men to a better understanding

* Preface, edition in 8vo. 1746, p. x. xv.

of one another, and to promote union. “The
“ settling on some equivocal formularies will never,”
says he, “ lay the contention that has arisen con-
“ cerning the chief points in difference between the
“ Lutherans and the Calvinists.”* This prelate,
it may be observed, while he attempted to conciliate
all parties, by placing subscription on such grounds
as he conceived might justify a submission to it by
men of discordant sentiments, yet it appears, did
himself entirely disapprove of it as a condition of
serving in the Church. For the conclusion to
“ The History of his own Times,” written nine
years after the publication of his Exposition, de-
clared this explicitly and strongly ; “ the requiring
“ subscriptions to the thirty-nine articles,” he
says, “ is a great imposition; I believe them all
“ myself. The greater part subscribe without
“ ever examining them ; and others do it, though
“ they can hardly satisfy their consciences about
“ some things in them. Churches and societies are
“ much better secured by laws than by subscrip-
“ tions ; it is a more reasonable as well as a more
“ easy method of government.”† This opinion
was not the result of late experience, but had been
long entertained by him. More than twenty years
before he wrote the above, when he saw, on his
travels into Switzerland and Italy, how strongly the
principal men at Geneva, where he was much
esteemed and carested, insisted upon “ consent of

* Blackburne’s Works, vol. v. p. 218.

† Burnet’s “ History,” vol. vi. p. 176.

“ doctrine,” to which they required a subscription from all who were admitted into orders, he employed all the eloquence he could command to represent the folly and ill consequences of such subscriptions, and to obtain an alteration in this practice. The force of his argument, the warmth and earnestness with which he expressed himself on this head, and the weight of his character, prevailed; the clergy at Geneva were released from these subscriptions, and left to punishment or censure only in case of writing or preaching against the established doctrine.* This concession, though it might afford some relief to tender consciences, and be an alteration for the better in the ecclesiastical establishment of Geneva, yet proceeded on the same principle as the imposition of subscription, namely, that of human authority in religion; it was as real, though not in an equal degree, a bar to freedom of enquiry; and it laid a snare for many upright minds, who would esteem it a duty to expose errors of doctrine and practice as well as to detect them, and openly to avow the truth as well as to embrace it.

It reflects honour, however, on Dr. Burnet, that he, not then a dignitary of his own church, and a stranger, could carry a point in a foreign country, which afterwards he could not, even when a prelate, attempt at home; where he was obliged to satisfy himself with placing subscription on an equivocal ground, instead of obtaining the abolition of it. The method adopted by him in his celebrated work,

* Burnet's "History," vol. vi. p. 263.

was not likely to satisfy every mind. The latitude of interpretation for which his lordship pleaded, was inconsistent with the clearness and precision which are essential qualities in a standard of faith ; it stood in direct contradiction to the design expressed in the title of the articles, which is declared to be “ for the avoiding of the diversities of opinion, “ and for the establishing of consent touching true “ religion ;” and the prelate’s explanation of the nature and end of subscription was only the opinion of one individual, though a person of high rank ; it was unsupported by any authority, by any declaration from the head of the church of England, to explain or supersede the statute of the 13th of Queen Elizabeth, which gives the legal authority to the requisition of subscription, and which enacts it with the express design, not to allow, but to prevent a diversity of opinion. This design can be secured only by believing them to be true in one precise uniform sense. On this subject the judgment of Bishop Taylor, who wrote before Burnet, carries conviction with it. “ He that subscribes must do it “ to those purposes, and in that sense and signifi- “ cation of things, which the supreme power intends “ in his commanding it.” As to that latitude of interpretation, which admits the subscribers to assent to the same form of words in what sense they please, “ this,” observes the prelate, “ is the last remedy “ against the evils and difficulties arising from the “ requisition of subscription, but it is the worst ; it “ hath in it something of craft, but very little of

“ ingenuity ; and if it can serve the ends of peace, or
“ of external charity, or of a phantastic concord ;
“ yet it cannot serve the ends of truth and holiness,
“ and christian simplicity.”*

“ The Exposition,” however it may be thought to fail in attaining the end which the author principally proposed to himself by its publication, is a monument of his talents and abilities, and deserves to be regarded as a work highly useful to the theological student ; as a work composed on a large and extensive plan, on laborious researches into the works of the most learned divines in the several divisions of Christendom, begun by this very able writer, when he filled the divinity professor’s chair at Glasgow, and to which his attention had been directed for more than thirty years.

It was attacked with great warmth and vehemence, in “ A Prefatory Discourse to an Examination of
“ the Bishop of Sarum’s Exposition on the Thirty-
“ nine Articles ;” generally ascribed to Dr. Binckes. Then came out “ An Examination of his Exposition
“ of the Second Article ;” by Dr. Jonathan Edwards, principal of Jesus college in Oxford ; this was followed by “ A Vindication of the 23d Article
“ from his Exposition of it.” The Bishop published a sheet, which he entitled, “ Remarks on the
“ Examination of the Exposition of the Second
“ Article of our Church ;” and from the pen of a friend came, “ An Answer to the Prefatory Dis-
“ course ;” and “ A Defence of his Exposition of

* Blackburne’s Works, vol. vii, p. 326, 333.

“ the 23d Article” closed with a propofal, that they who were fo angry with the Bifhop’s Exposition fhould give the world a better.*

* Calamy, vol. i. p. 643.

CHAPTER VI.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF EMINENT
CHARACTERS AND WRITERS.

MANY of the ministers ejected by the Bartholomew Act, in 1662, lived to hail the Revolution, and made a considerable figure in the reigns of King William and Queen Mary ; and in different years of that period finished their virtuous and honourable course of labours and sufferings. A just respect has been paid to their names in the short memoirs of them from the pens of *Calamy* and *Palmer* : to whom the reader is referred. But there is a propriety, without entering minutely into their history, in taking some notice of them in this work according to the chronological order of their deaths. Among these, the first who was removed from this world,

In 1689, was Dr. *Obadiah Grew*, who had held the vicarage of St. Michael's, Coventry ; beloved by all parties, and had in great veneration by the gentlemen of the county. He displayed a singular integrity and fortitude of character in freely remonstrating with Lieut.-General Cromwell in person,

when at Coventry, on a design then visibly on foot against the life of King Charles I. and obtained his promise to endeavour to prevent it; of which Dr. Grew afterwards reminded him by letter. He could not by any threats be induced to read, on the rising in Cheshire, the proclamation against Sir G. Booth. And when the plague alarmed the city, he kept open the meetings, till he was forced to remove by the Oxford Act. He was the father of Dr. Nehemiah Grew, who died March 25, 1711; well known for his “Anatomy of Plants,” and other ingenious works; and esteemed for his skill in the medical profession, his philosophical knowledge, and his piety.*

In 1690, aged 66, died *John Collins*, D.D. who had been vicar of St. Stephen's, Norwich, and forty-four years a minister in that city: “a man of various learning, and excelling as a textuary and a critic; and generally esteemed for his great industry, humanity, and exemplary piety.” His virtues and abilities gave him an interest, notwithstanding his nonconformity, with many illustrious and celebrated persons. He drew up the Annotations of several books of Poole's Exposition of the Bible: and besides many controversial and practical works, was the author of a work entitled “The Weaver's Pocket Book, or Weaving Spiritualized,” 8vo. formed on the principle of adapting his devotional and practical remarks to the ideas and employments of a people famous for the manufacture of stuffs.†

* Noble's Biographical History of England in continuation of Granger, vol. i. p. 231, 232.

† Granger's Biographical History of England, vol. iii. p. 306, 307.

February 7, Mr. *John Faldo*, aged 57; who had been a chaplain in the army, and had no benefice when the Act of Uniformity took place, but was silenced by it. He became afterwards pastor of a congregation in London.

In 1691, on June the 26th, aged 63, Mr. *John Flavell*, ejected from the rectory of Townstall *alias* St. Clement's, Dartmouth. He was educated at the University college in Oxford. His works collected together form two volumes folio, and eight 8vo. distinguished by a plain, popular, and tender strain, and by a spirit of piety. He adopted the way of spiritualizing the common objects and employments of life in two treatises, one on the practice of "Husbandry," and the other on the art of "Navigation." In 1685, several aldermen of the town so forgot the decorum, duty, and dignity of their office, as to head the rabble in carrying about a ridiculous effigy of the worthy and excellent man, to which were affixed the Covenant and the Bill of Exclusion: on which he withdrew from the town, under an apprehension that such insults, countenanced by the magistrates, might be followed with injuries to his person. §

In December, aged 76, the celebrated *Richard Baxter*, sixteen years lecturer at Kidderminster. The peculiar traits and contrasts in his character and history are delineated with propriety and energy by the pen of Mr. Granger; who describes him as "a man famous for weakness of body and strength

§ Granger, vol. iii. p. 334.

“ of mind ; for having the strongest sense of religion
“ himself, and exciting a sense of it in the thoughtless
“ and the profligate ; for preaching more sermons,
“ engaging in more controversies, and writing more
“ books, than any other nonconformist of his age.
“ He spoke, disputed, and wrote with ease ; and dis-
“ covered the same intrepidity when he reprov-
“ Cromwell and expostulated with Charles II., as
“ when he preached to a congregation of mecha-
“ nics.”† He was chaplain to Charles II. and de-
fended the monarchy in a conference with Cromwell.
When government in the year 1672, in the reign of
Charles II. issued an order that a yearly pension of
50*l.* each should be paid to most of the presbyterian
ministers, and of 100*l.* to the chief of the party,
Mr. Baxter sent back his pension, and would not
touch it.* A rare instance of disinterested integrity
and firmness. He was interred in Christchurch,
London, and his funeral was attended by a number
of persons of different rank, and by many dignitaries
of the established church. His works consisted of
145 different treatises.

. In 1692, Feb. 15, Mr. *Thomas Rosewell* ; pre-
viously to the Act of Uniformity, rector of Sutton-
Mandeville in Wiltshire. In 1674 he accepted an
invitation to succeed Mr. James Janeway at Rother-
hithe ; having passed the intermediate years in several
families of rank, particularly in that of Lady Hun-
gerford. The most remarkable event in the life of
this pious worthy was his being arraigned, tried,

† Granger, vol. iii. p. 339. * Burnet's History, vol. ii. p. 16,

and convicted of treason, on the 23d of October, in 1684, before Lord Chief Justice Jefferies. He was charged on the ground of treasonable words uttered by him in a sermon delivered on the 14th of the preceding September at Rotherhithe. The witnesses against him were three women, common informers against conventicles, lewd and infamous persons, laden with guilt of former perjuries, who could not prove by any circumstance that they were at his meeting, or that any person saw them there on that day; and yet they swore to or two three periods with so much exactness, that there was not the smallest variation in their depositions; and though they affected such great clearness and precision as to the words alleged, they could remember no other passage in the sermon, not even the text. Several who heard it, and some who wrote it in short-hand, declared that Mr. Rosewell said no such words, nor any thing to that purpose. He made a strong defence of himself, proving his loyalty even in the days of Cromwell; and urging that he constantly prayed for the king in his family, and had inculcated the obligations to loyalty in his sermons. “He offered
“to put the whole upon this issue; that he would
“pronounce a period as long as that to which they
“had sworn, with the usual tone of voice with which
“he preached, and then leave it to them to repeat
“it if they could.” He offered his own notes to prove the falsehood of the accusation; but no regard was paid to these pleas by the Court, though his defence was applauded by most of the hearers,

and was pronounced by some gentlemen of the long robe to be the best defence made by any man in those times. The judge, however, conducted the trial, which lasted seven hours, with vehemence, and urged the conviction of the prisoner; laying it down as a first principle, that all preaching at conventicles was treasonable, and that this ought to dispose the jury to believe any evidence upon that head; so the jury brought Mr. Rosewell in guilty: upon which, Bishop Burnet relates, “there was a shameful rejoicing.” The passing of sentence was postponed to the 24th of November. When, in the mean time, the words on which Mr. Rosewell was convicted, came to be examined by men learned in the law, they were found not to be treason by any statute. On this he moved for an arrest of judgment, till counsel could be heard on that point. Several circumstances concurred to secure the success of this petition. Sir John Talbot, a gentleman far from being accounted a friend to dissenters, was present during the trial, and was so affected by the mode of its process, that he went immediately from it to the king, and represented to him that he had seen the life of a gentleman and a scholar in danger, upon evidence on which he would not hang a dog; and urged it on his Majesty, that if he suffered him to die, none of his subjects could be safe in their houses. Before he had withdrawn, Judge Jefferies came into the royal presence with an air of exultation and triumph, and congratulated the king on the conviction of a traitor; who received the information with

expressing a concern for the life of Mr. Rosewell, and an injunction on the chief justice to find some way to bring him off. The king felt ashamed of the proceedings, on many other reports made to him of the witnesses. He was also induced, from particular respect to Mrs. James, a lady, who, it appears by the event, had great influence with his Majesty, to promise his life, when from a conviction of the innocence of Mr. Rosewell, and the injury done him, she went to the king and begged it. The attorney-general had orders to yield to the arrest of judgment. "This," Burnet observes, "was thought a good point gained, which might turn to the advantage of the subject, to allow that a point of law might be argued after conviction." The jury soon felt great compunction at the verdict which they had given; and invited Sir Peter Rich, who appeared on the trial as the friend of Mr. Rosewell, the day after it to dine with them at the Swan Tavern in Old Fish-street, to consult what steps could be taken to save his life; urging, that if Mr. Rosewell suffered, it would be very unjustly. But no method of retrieving what was done occurred to his thoughts.

On the 24th of November, Mr. Rosewell was brought up to the court to receive sentence, when he requested to be heard on the causes for which he prayed an arrest of judgment. After some debates between the bench and the king's counsel, the lord chief justice, who now assumed the character of an advocate for the prisoner, supported his request, and

repeatedly and strongly recommended caution and deliberation where the *life* of a man was depending ; and counsel was assigned to plead on the errors and invalidity of the indictment. On the 26th and 27th of November the court met again to hear counsel. When they had finished, the chief justice again laboured to impress on the minds of the other judges sentiments favourable to the accused, and observed that truly he never had seen an indictment so loosely hung together, and that by their law-books they were bound in cases of that nature to be counsel for the prisoner ; and he still held it up to their consideration that this was a case in which the life of a man was concerned : a consideration which had little or no weight with his lordship on the trial. But he now knew how the king's mind was disposed towards the prisoner. After all, no motion was made by the attorney-general, nor did the court come to a decision ; but Mr. Rosewell was commanded back to prison to wait for a rule of court to bring him up again at the next term. In the mean time the king granted a pardon under the great seal ; and as soon as it was finished, his Majesty died. Mr. Rosewell pleaded it some few days after, and on giving bail was discharged. It appears, that though the judge on the trial had intermingled with the examination of witnesses virulent invectives against the accused, and aimed to prejudice the jury ; when Mr. Rosewell moved by his counsel to arrest the judgment for an error of form in the records, this same man not only advocated the cause of the prisoner with an appear-

ance of candour and equity, but forgetting the decorum and gravity to be preserved on the bench, indulged in levity and jocularity. “He could not contain himself, but openly rejoiced at the accident, and was tickled with mirth and laughing at the king’s council. But the serious observation was,” says my author, “that after he had urged the prosecution of Rosewell, and a fault slipped, he should so merrily discharge him.”*

It will, it is presumed, be deemed an agreeable addition to this narrative, if the sentiments of the late great statesman, the Right Hon. Charles James Fox, be laid before the reader. “I have little doubt but the account you have seen of Jefferies’s conduct and motive is the true one ; at the same time it must be confessed, that, according to the account in the state-trials, he acted his part very well ; and the pardon coming after the legal doubts looks rather as if it was given, not to let off Jefferies easy, but on the contrary to avoid bringing the king’s lawyers to shame, by exposing the imperfection of their indictment. However, even without this story, Jefferies’s character is such that one cannot for a moment believe his having done right, but with some crooked motive. I have read before, I know not where, an account, without the name of Talbot, something similar to

* Life of Sir Francis Dudley, lord keeper, vol. ii. p. 107 ; Rosewell’s Life and Trial, p. 54, 58, 59, 63 ; Trial, p. 63, 84, 85, 86, 100, 105, et alibi, p. 246, 250, 252, and p. 323 ; Burnet, vol. ii. p. 444—446.

“ that which you cite ; and I think it the more
“ likely, because Charles II. had a very good and
“ quick understanding, especially in regard to mat-
“ ters which were ridiculously absurd, as the evi-
“ dence against Rosewell is.”*

By a warrant dated 28th May 1687, issued by King James, Mr. Rosewell and his sureties, he in a bond of 500l. and they in one of 2000l. were discharged from their bail. After he had received the king's pardon, he immediately returned to his ministerial work ; though for the sake of his bail he carefully kept within the limits of the law : but after the indulgence was granted, he resumed his character in an open and public manner ; and with great assiduity and diligence discharged its duties to a very numerous congregation for seven years after his honourable acquittal, in the enjoyment of a

* A Letter with which the author was honoured, 3d May 1802, in reply to one which he wrote to Mr. Fox, in consequence of some enquiries communicated to him from the Hon. Gentleman, relative to the account of the circuit of Judge Jefferies, in the “ History of Taunton,” chap. ix. p. 109, &c. It seems to have escaped the attention of Mr. Fox, that the pardon came too late to save the reputation of the king's counsel, as the imperfections of the indictment had been previously pleaded in arrest of judgment ; and it is presumed that in his approbation of Jefferies's conduct, Mr. Fox refers to the part he took in favour of the prisoner. After the author had written the above narrative of Mr. Rosewell's case, he referred to Neal's History, where he found, though he did not recollect it, the proceedings had been stated ; but he trusts that from the nature of them, and the new matter which he has been able to furnish, no apology is necessary to justify the appearance of the narrative again in this work. The account without the name of Talbot, to which Mr. Fox alludes, was the state of this affair given by Bishop Burnet in his “ History of his own Times.”

great measure of health, till his last sickness, (the effect of a cold caught at the funeral of Mr. Baxter,) which terminated his life at the age of 62, on Feb. 13th, 1692. It deserves to be mentioned to the honour of two clergymen, his contemporaries, and as testimonies of the opinion entertained of his innocence, and the esteem in which his character was held, that one of them, Mr. Meriton, minister of St. Nicholas Cole-Abbey in Old Fish-street, publicly prayed for him in the church during his imprisonment; and the other, Mr. Jekyll, of the New Chapel at Westminster, frequently visited him in the Gatehouse. Many hundreds of people attended the funeral from Draper's Hall, whence he was carried to interment in Bunhill; and in the spirit of that union which had been lately formed between the two denominations, his pall was supported by three presbyterian and three independent ministers.*

On the 16th of November 1692, died Mr. Rich. Steel, ejected from the living of Hanmere in Flintshire, and during his residence there the intimate friend of the excellent Mr. Philip Henry. He was born near Nantwich in Cheshire, on the 10th May 1629; studied several years in St. John's college, Cambridge; and was afterwards incorporated into the university of Oxford. The difficulty in respect to conformity which pressed on his mind with peculiar weight and seriousness, was that the publication of the book of common prayer, to which the Act of Uniformity required a declaration of unfeigned

* Life, p. 66—68, 72, 73, 76.

assent and consent, had been so deferred, that he had not seen nor could see it before the Act took place. This was the case with many others. Before and after this Mr. Steel met with much trouble, and was harassed by vexatious proceedings against him on the account of his nonconformity. About 1667, he removed from London, where he afterwards gathered a congregation, which assembled for divine worship in Armourer's Hall in Coleman-street. His principal works were, 1. "An Antidote against Distractions in the Worship of God;" written in prison, and which went through several impressions. 2. "The Tradesman Calling;" one of the treatises given away by the Society for promoting religious knowledge.*

In 1694, on the 15th of July, at the age of 83, Mr. Thomas Gilbert, B. D. of Edmund's Hall, Oxford, ejected from Winchenden in Buckinghamshire, finished his course. He was esteemed as a man of extraordinary acuteness and an excellent scholar; who was perfectly familiar with all the schoolmen, and yet took great delight in poetry, and was himself a good Latin poet. It is related of him, that on a particular occasion when he was in company with Dr. South at Oxford, and some eminent characters of the University, the conversation turning on some Arminian points, and Mr. Gilbert maintaining that the *predestination* of the Calvinists did necessarily follow from the *prescience* of the Arminians, Dr. South challenged him to prove that

* Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. p. 448—451.

assertion, engaging in that case to relinquish his Arminian sentiments. Mr. Gilbert undertook to do it, and managed his argument and opponent in a way that was highly pleasing to the company, and satisfactory and convincing to the Doctor, who became and continued to the last a zealous assertor of predestination. It should seem, that though Mr. Gilbert was on this head a Calvinist, he was not so on every question connected with the Calvinistic system; for among his publications was a small Latin tract “on the possibility of pardon without a satisfaction;” in answer to Dr. Owen’s “*Diatriba de Divinâ Justitiâ.*” It reflects honour on his memory, that at Oxford, where he spent the latter part of his life, he met with great respect from those who were able judges of real worth; Dr. Hall, bishop of Bristol, Dr. Bathurst, Dr. Jane, and others.*

The next year, 1695, closed the sufferings and lives of three others of the pious worthies, Mr. Robert Billio, Mr. Henry Newcome, and Mr. Richard Mayo.

Mr. *Robert Billio*, of Trinity college, Cambridge, ejected from Wickham, near Malden in Essex, died on April 19, aged about 73. He was a zealous, fervent preacher, whose plain and methodical sermons, expressive of the earnestness with which he sought the glory of God, and the holiness and salvation of his hearers, shewing him to be the good man, and uttered with a strong voice, were heard with great effect on the minds of his

* Palmer, vol. i. p. 243.

hearers, and were very useful in promoting the ends which he had in view. He was wonderfully preserved in season of persecution ; and once narrowly escaped being taken, as he was preaching at the house of Israel Mayo, esq; at Bayton near Hertford, by being conveyed into a garret, and covered in a dark hole with billets.

On the 8th of September terminated the life and ministry of Mr. *Richard Mayo*, in the 64th year of his age ; who, before the Act of Uniformity, held the vicarage of Kingston-on-Thames in Surry ; and during his residence in that town had preached for several years to crowded auditories a weekly lecture in Whitechapel Church, London, with more than ordinary animation and zeal. After his secession from the establishment, he experienced a variety of changes ; till, towards the latter end of the reign of Charles II. he became the pastor of a large and flourishing congregation at Buckingham-house, College Hill, which afterwards erected the present meeting-house in Salter's Hall, London, where he was many years an affectionate and useful preacher. His sermons were derived from the text, and were distinguished by clearness and method. He was a man of great learning and ingenuity, and well skilled in polemical and practical divinity ; a friend to peace and union. Sincerity and prudence marked his conduct, and an excellent sweetness of temper ran through his deportment ; and his unwearied zeal was not checked by any discouragements. “ His end was like the

“light of the evening when the sun setteth, an evening without any clouds.”*

On the 20th of the above month, Mr. *Henry Newcombe*, M. A. of St. John's college, Cambridge, where he had made great proficiency in philosophy and theology by a close attention to study, and who had heartily appeared with Sir George Booth in the interests of Charles II. was cast out of the living at Manchester; and afterwards, by the Oxford Act, forced to remove into Ellenbroke. He subsequently returned, when he could do so with safety, to his family and flock, and preached privately, till under more auspicious times he could procure a licence for a place of worship. At length a stately chapel was built by his congregation; but he had not long preached in it before he was removed by death, in the 68th year of his age. He kept up an amicable correspondence with many conforming clergy. His mind was enriched with a large stock of solid learning and knowledge. His temper was sincere, candid, and generous. His deportment was grave, yet sweet and obliging. An inartificial humility veiled and adorned his other excellencies. His charity to those who differed from him was accompanied with great veneration for their worth. As a preacher he excelled in a natural eloquence not easily imitated by others, and in a happy way of insinuating himself into the bosoms of his hearers, whose only regret was that the sermon must soon be at an end. An

* Mr. Taylor's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Mayo, p. 26, 27, 29; Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. p. 10.

eminent divine on hearing him once said, “if I had
“this man’s tongue, I could not help being proud of
“it.” His attachment to the royal family was ex-
pressed by a sermon on the restoration of Charles II.
entitled “Usurpation defeated, and David restored.”*

Two men of eminence in the list of ejected mi-
nisters were called to their reward in the year 1696,
Dr. *Samuel Annesley*, and Mr. *Philip Henry*.

The name of Dr. *Samuel Annesley*, born at Kennil-
worth near Warwick, A. D. 1620, of noble family
connexions, being first cousin to Arthur Annesley,
earl of Anglesey, and lord privy seal in the reign of
Charles II. will be transmitted down in the pages of
ecclesiastical biography as that of the maternal grand-
father of the celebrated Mr. John Wesley. When
he was fifteen, he was admitted a student in Queen’s
college, Oxford, where at the usual periods he took
his degrees in arts. In 1644, he became chaplain to
the Earl of Warwick, the admiral of the Parliament’s
fleet. By his interest with persons in power he ob-
tained the valuable living of Cliff in Kent. In
1648, he was honoured by the University of Oxford,
at the instance of Philip earl of Pembroke, with
the title of doctor of laws. In the same year he
resumed his station at sea as chaplain to his patron
the Earl of Warwick, who was employed in giving
chace to that part of the English navy which went
over to the prince, afterwards Charles II. In 1662,
he was elected minister of St. John the Evangelist in
London, by the unanimous votes of the inhabitants,

* Palmer, vol. ii. p. 98.

In 1652, he was nominated by Oliver, lord-protector, lecturer in St. Paul's. In 1660, after three presentations, first by the Protector Richard, then by the trustees for the maintenance of ministers, and lastly from King Charles II. the most legal and secure title, he was fixed in the vicarage of St. Giles's, Cripplegate. From this living he was ejected for nonconformity, on Bartholomew day 1662. Upon the indulgence in 1672, he licensed a meeting-house in Little St. Helen's; where he continued the pastor of a flourishing congregation till his death. After the secession of Dr. Bates and Mr. Howe from the Pinner's Hall lecture, he was chosen one of the lecturers with them on the establishment of a new lecture at Salter's Hall. On the death of Mr. Case, the chief management of the morning lecture, of which he had been the main support, with his own consent devolved upon him. Several ministers, whose useful labours the church would not otherwise have enjoyed, owed to him, principally if not solely, their education or subsistence. By his useful active exertions preaching was introduced into many obscure and benighted villages. The poor looked to him as their common father. He expended a considerable sum in the distribution of bibles, catechisms, and other useful books. He possessed a good paternal estate; and devoted the tenths of all salaries and incomes, before any part was spent, to charitable purposes. His character was drawn in few but expressive terms by Mr. Baxter, as that of "a most sincere, godly, and humble man." His retrospect in his last

sickness, was satisfactory, serene, and consolatory. "Blessed be God," said he, "I have been faithful in the work of the ministry above 55 years."*

On the 24th of June in the same year, died, at the age of sixty-five, Mr. *Philip Henry*, a name of great celebrity in the annals of English nonconformity. The life of this pious worthy, written by his son, and of late years republished by Mr. Job Orton, is well known. It was a favourite piece of biography, with the late Sir James Stonhouse, who bears testimony to the merit of the subject of it as "an excellent man." It does honour to the work itself, and to the virtues of the character it exhibits, that a dignitary of the church has introduced it at full length into the valuable biographical collection, with which he has favoured the public, and enrolled the name of Mr. Philip Henry, with some of the first characters that have blessed the world, and been the glory of England.† Another historical biographer and a clergyman, speaking of Mr. Henry's refusing to conform, says, "his non-compliance was a great injury to the church, for he was eminently qualified as a divine, a scholar, and a gentleman, for one of its ministers."‡

In the next year, 1697, the cause of nonconformity lost the active exertions of three other ministers, who had been its advocates and ornaments. One of these was Mr. Nathaniel Vincent, who died

* Palmer, vol. i. p. 104, 106; Wilson, vol. i. p. 365, 370.

† Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, 6th vol. 8vo. 1810.

‡ Granger's Biographical History of England, vol. i. p. 124.

on the 22d of June, aged 53 ; so sudden and violent was the attack of illness which carried him out of life, that he had leisure only to exclaim with deliberate pathos and devotion, " I find I am dying ;
" LORD, LORD, LORD have mercy on my family
" and my congregation ! " He was the son of a pious minister, Mr. John Vincent. Such was the early pregnancy of his genius, and so retentive was his memory, - that he used, at seven years of age, to repeat the sermons of his father in the family on the evening. He became a member of Magdalen college, Oxford, in the eleventh year of his age took the degree of Master of Arts, when he was about eighteen ; preached as a lecturer at Pulborow in Essex, before he was twenty ; and at twenty-one he was ordained, and fixed as rector of Langley Marsh in Buckinghamshire, from which place he was ejected. " He soon became," Mr. Granger observes, " a very noted preacher and writer ; and
" as he was one of the most assiduous, so he was
" also one of the most unfortunate," rather it should be said, most harassed and persecuted, " of his
" nonconforming brethren." He once escaped an imprisonment of three years, to be followed with banishment, on an Act of the 25th of Elizabeth, by a flaw in the indictment. After his ejection he spent a few years in a private family, and then, soon after the great fire, he removed to London, and preached to multitudes amidst the ruins ; where undoubtedly the awful spectacle before him and his hearers, would much add to the effect of his serious

and fervent addressees. The consciences of many were awakened, and a respectable congregation was formed under his ministry in Southwark. It is related of him, that he scarcely entered into any company, but he was like a box of precious ointment, and left some sweet perfume from his heavenly discourse after his departure.*

About a month after Mr. Vincent, on the 28th July, died Mr. *Nathaniel Mather*, ejected from Barnstaple in Devon, the second son of Mr. Richard Mather, an eminent puritan divine, who was twice suspended for his nonconformity, and to avoid such harassing processes, removed to America in 1635, “leaving the fair fields of his own country for the “obscure places of the wilderness.” He settled as the pastor of a congregation at Dorchester, August 23d, 1636; in which connection he continued till his death, April 22d, 1669, in the 73d year of his age, leaving a name and a family of great celebrity in the northern part of the western continent. His son, of whom we are speaking, was only five years old when his father emigrated to New England, where of course he received the first rudiments of classical and academical learning, and became a graduate of Harvard college in 1647; but he finished his studies in England. His first preferment was the living of Harberton, near Tiverton, in Devon; and in 1656, Oliver Cromwell presented him to that of Barnstaple in the same county. On his ejection

* Granger’s Biographical History, vol. iii. p. 328; Mr. Nathaniel Taylor’s Funeral Sermon for Mr. Nathaniel Vincent, p. 24, 26.

he went into Holland, and settled as a minister at Rotterdam, and then returned to London; and in 1671, on the death of his elder brother Mr. Samuel Mather, he succeeded him as pastor of a congregation in Dublin. In 1688, he became pastor of an independent congregation in Paved Alley, Lime-street, London, and was chosen one of the lecturers at Pinner's Hall. He died in the 68th year of his age, having discharged the duties of the ministry with diligence and fidelity for forty-seven years. A Latin inscription on his monument in Bunhill fields delineates his talents, endowments, and virtues, and perpetuates his name with honourable praise. Dr. Watts also paid a tribute of respect to his character, in a very descriptive epitaph, in his lyric poems. In his ministrations he had the sacred art of concealing the *man*, that GOD alone might be seen and exalted; “*In sacræ functionis exercitiis arte pia celavit hominem, ut solus conspiceretur Deus.*”*

In September 1697, died Mr. *Thomas Cole*, M. A. ejected by the King's commissioners, 1660, from St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, where he became principal in 1656, and tutor to some who afterwards were distinguished as divines in the church of England, or as eminent scholars, and particularly to the great Mr. Locke. He was the son of Mr. William Cole, a gentleman of independent fortune in the city of London, where he was born in 1627. He received his classical education in Westminster,

* Palmer, vol. i. p. 339; Wilson, vol. i. p. 232.

whence he was elected student of Christ-Church, Oxford. After his ejection, he opened an academy at Nettlebed in Oxfordshire. He then removed to London, and was the pastor of an independent congregation, gathered during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, which removed its meetings to different places, and during his connection with it assembled first in Tallow-Chandlers' Hall, then in Pinner's Hall, and lastly in Lorimer's Hall. Mr. Cole was afterwards elected one of the Tuesday's lecturers at Pinner's Hall ; and in that relation he took an active part in the controversy concerning what was called the Neonomian doctrine, which he opposed with strict integrity and steady zeal, under a firm persuasion of the truth and importance of the views that he entertained on the questions in debate. His name is transmitted down as that of a man of good learning, of polite manners, of a most innocent and spotless life, and of eminent virtue and piety. The conversations which he had with several friends in the prospect of his approaching end, evinced a most tranquil and happy frame of mind ; and the sentiments which he occasionally uttered on rising incidents were remarkably expressive of serenity, resignation, and hope. Upon its being remarked to him, that he was sleepy ; he replied, " I shall sleep
" quickly, and awake in everlasting day. Ere long
" my days and nights will be all one. The apprehension that faith gives of a better life, is my
" comfort. As for my going, God can make it
" no loss to you. He can set on and take off his

“workmen, as He pleases.” On enquiring what time it was, he added, “Time passeth into eternity, we live but dying lives in the body, till death is swallowed up of life. I long to be immortal.”*

In the year 1698, on March 25, died Mr. *Matthew Barker*, M. A. of Trinity college, Cambridge, a man of considerable learning, great piety, and universal candour and moderation; ejected from St. Leonard, Eastcheap, London. He wrote the annotations, in Pool’s Continuation, on both the Epistles to the Theſſalonians. A reflection on the state of his mind, on the weekly return of his public ministerial services, which occurs in a MS. account of himself, is an amiable and striking expression of his diffident and pious solicitude in the discharge of them. “I am commonly more humbled and troubled in my mind on a LORD’s day than on any other day of the week, through the fear of my failings in the work of the ministry.”†

In the course of the next year, 1699, two persons of peculiar note, as nonconformist ministers finished their course. One of these, who died on the 14th July, reputed one of the best orators and politest writers of his age among the presbyterians, at one time chaplain to Charles II. “much a scholar, much a gentleman, and no less a christian,” as Mr. Granger delineates his character, was *William Bates*, D. D. born 1625, and ejected from St. Dunstan’s in

* Wood’s *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. p. 775; Wilson, vol. iii. p. 79, 89; Palmer, vol. ii. p. 193, 196.

† Palmer, vol. i. p. 121.

the West. He was the friend of Archbishop Tillotson, by whom he was greatly esteemed both for his learning and good temper. "His abilities," says the writer just quoted, "qualified him for the highest dignities in the church; and it is certain great offers were made to him, but he could never be prevailed with to conform." He published, besides various theological and practical works, a biographical one, entitled, "*Vitæ selectæ aliquot virorum*;" which is principally a collection.*

The other ejected minister, who, at the age of 70, died on the 16th of October, this year, the author of several single sermons, and of a tract of celebrity, and esteemed an excellent performance, entitled "*The Almost Christian*," was Mr. *Matthew Mead*, whom the Bartholomew Act dispossessed of the living of Stepney, near London. He afterwards, upon the liberty granted to the dissenters, collected a congregation in this place, and built a spacious meeting, the four large pillars in which were a present from the States of Holland. He was descended from a good family in Buckinghamshire, long an eminent preacher, of considerable fame as a casuist and a writer, and derived honour to his name from the great eminence of his son, as a scholar, as a patron of learning, and as a physician; who for many years attended on George II. in that professional character. Mr. Mead, among other innocent persons, was accused as an accomplice in the Rye-House plot, but was acquitted, on a full vindication

* Palmer, vol. i. p. 101, &c.; Granger, vol. iii. p. 304—5.

of his innocence by Charles II. when he was heard on the charge before the privy council. He was a gentleman and a scholar, and a most excellent preacher, according to the grateful testimony of respect paid to his name and memory by one who had been his ward.*

* Palmer, vol. ii. p. 185; Granger, vol. iii. p. 332, 333; Peirce's Vindication of the Dissenters, part i. p. 258.



APPENDIX.

NUMBER I. to Page 11.

*The Case of the Protestant Dissenters represented
and argued. By Mr. John Howe.*

THEY are under one common obligation with the rest of mankind, by the universal law of nature, to worship GOD in assemblies.

Men of all sorts of religions that have ever obtained in the world, Jews, Pagans, Mahometans, Christians, have in their practice acknowledged this obligation. Nor can it be understood how such a practice should be so universal, otherwise than from the dictate and impresson of the universal law.

Whereas the religion professed in England is that of reformed christianity, some things are annexed to the allowed public worship which are acknowledged to be no parts thereof, nor in themselves necessary; but which the dissenters judge to be in some part sinful.

They cannot, therefore, with good conscience towards GOD, attend wholly and solely upon the public worship which the laws do appoint.

The same laws do strictly forbid their assembling to worship GOD otherwise.

Which is, in effect, the same thing as if they who made or shall continue such laws, should plainly say, if you will

not consent with us in our superadded rites and modes against your consciences, you shall not worship GOD ; or if you will not accept of our additions to the christian religion, you shall not be christians ; and manifestly tends to reduce to Paganism a great part of a christian nation.

They have been wont therefore to meet however in distinct assemblies, and to worship GOD in a way which their consciences could approve ; and have many years continued so to do, otherwise than as they have been hindered by violence.

It is therefore upon the whole fit to enquire,

2. 1. Whether they are to be blamed for their holding distinct meetings for the worship of GOD ?

For answer to this, it cannot be expected that all the controversies should be here determined, which have been agitated about the lawfulness of each of those things which have been added to the christian religion and worship by the present constitution of the church of England.

But supposing they were none of them simply unlawful, while yet the misinformed minds of the dissenters could not judge them lawful, though they have made it much their business to enquire and search ; being urged also by severe sufferings, which through a long tract of time they have undergone, not to refuse any means that might tend to their satisfaction ; they could have nothing else left them to do than to meet and worship distinctly as they have.

For they could not but esteem the obligation of the universal, natural, and divine law, by which they were bound solemnly to worship GOD, less questionable than that of a law, which was only positive, topical, and human, requiring such and such additaments to their worship, and prohibiting their worship without them.

The church of England (as that part affects to be called) distinguished from the rest by those additions to christian religion, (pretended to be indifferent, and so confessed unnecessary) hath not only sought to ingross to itself the ordinances of divine worship, but all civil power. So that the privileges that belong either to christian or human society are inclosed, and made peculiar to such as are distinguished by things that in themselves can signify nothing to the making of persons either better christians, or better men.

2. 2. Whether the laws enjoining such additions to our religion, as the exclusive terms of christian worship and communion, ought to have been made; when it is acknowledged on all hands the things to be added were before not necessary; and when it is known a great number judge them sinful, and must thereby be restrained from worshipping the true and living GOD?

A. The question to any of common sense answers itself. For it is not put concerning such as dissent from any part of the substance of worship which GOD hath commanded, but concerning such additions as he never commanded. And there are sufficient tests to distinguish such dissenters from those that deny any substantial part of religion, or assert any thing contrary thereto. Wherefore to forbid such to worship that GOD that made them, because they cannot receive your devised additions, is to exclude that which is necessary, for the mere want of that which is unnecessary. And where is that man that will adventure to stand forth, and avow the hindering of such persons from paying their homage to the GOD that made them, if we thus expostulate the matter on GOD's behalf and their own? Will you cut off from GOD his right in the creatures he hath made? Will you cut off

from them the means of their salvation upon these terms? What reply can the matter admit?

'Tis commonly alleged that great deference is to be paid to the laws, and that we ought to have forbore our assemblies, till the public authority recalled the laws against them: and we will say the same thing, when it is well proved that they who made such laws made the world too.

And by whose authority were such laws made? Is there any that is not from GOD? And hath GOD given any man authority to make laws against himself, and to deprive him of his just rights from his own creatures?

Nor if the matter be well searched into, could there be so much as a pretence of authority derived for such purposes from the people, whom every one now acknowledges the first receptacle of derived governing power. GOD can, it is true, lay indisputable obligations by his known laws upon every conscience of man about religion or any thing else. And such as represent any people can, according to the constitution of the government, make laws for them about the things they entrust them with; but if the people of England be asked, man by man, will they say they did entrust to their representatives their religion and their consciences, to do with them what they please? When it is your own turn to be represented by others, is this part of the trust you commit? What Dr. Sherlock* worthily says concerning a bishop, he might (and, particularly after, doth) say concerning every other man, *he can be no more represented in a council than at the day of judgment: every man's soul and conscience must be in his own keeping, and can be represented by no man.*

It ought to be considered that christianity, wherein it superadds to the law of nature, is all matter of revelation. And it is well known that even among pagans, in the

* Vindication of some Protestant Principles, &c. p. 52.

settling rites and institutes of religion,* revelation was pretended at least, upon an implied principle that in such matters human power could not oblige the people's consciences.

We must be excused, therefore, if we have in our practice expressed less reverence for laws made by no authority received either from GOD or man.

We are therefore injuriously reflected on, when it is imputed to us, that we have, by the use of our liberty, acknowledged an illegal dispensing power. We have done no other thing herein than we did when no dispensation was given or pretended, in conscience of duty to Him that gave us our breath; nor did therefore practise otherwise because we thought those laws dispensed with, but because we thought them not laws. Whereupon little need remains of enquiring farther.

Q. 3. Whether such laws should be continued? Against which, besides what may be collected from that which hath been said, it is to be considered, that what is most principally grievous to us was enacted by that Parliament, that, as we have too much reason to believe, suffered itself to be dealt with to enslave the nation, in other respects as well as this; and which (to his immortal honour) the noble Earl of Danby procured to be dissolved, as the first step towards our national deliverance.

And let the tenor be considered of that horrid law, by which our Magna Charta was torn in pieces; the worst and most infamous of mankind, at our own expense, hired to accuse us; multitudes of perjuries committed; convictions made without a jury, and without any hearing of the persons accused; penalties inflicted, goods rifled,

* As by Numa from his Egeria. And their priests, to whom the regulation of such matters were left, were generally believed to be inspired.

estates seized and embezzled, houses broken up, families disturbed, often at unseasonable hours of the night, without any cause or shadow of a cause, if only a malicious villain would pretend to suspect a meeting there! No law in any other case like this! As if to worship God without those additions which were confessed unnecessary, were a greater crime than theft, felony, murder, or treason! Is it for our reputation to posterity that the memory of such a law should be continued?

And are we not yet awakened, and our eyes opened enough to see, that the making and execution of the laws, by which we have suffered so deeply for many by-past years, was only that protestants might destroy protestants, and the easier work be made for the introduction of popery that was to destroy the residue?

Nor can any malice deny, or ignorance of observing Englishmen overlook, this plain matter of fact: after the dissolution of that before-mentioned Parliament, dissenters were much caressed, and endeavoured to be drawn into a subserviency to the court designs, especially in the election of after parliaments. Notwithstanding which they every where so entirely fell in with the sober part of the nation in the choice of such persons for the three parliaments that next succeeded, (two held at Westminster, and that at Oxford,) as it was known would, and who did, most generously assert the liberties of the nation and the protestant religion. Which alone (and not our mere dissent from the church of England in matters of religion, wherein Charles II. was sufficiently known to be a prince of great indifferency) drew upon us, soon after the dissolution of the last of those parliaments, that dreadful storm of persecution, that destroyed not a small number of lives in gaols, and ruined multitudes of families.

Let English freemen remember, what they cannot but know, that it was for our firm adherence to the civil

interests of the nation, (not for our different modes of religion from the legal way, though the laws gave that advantage against us, which they did not against others,) that we endured the calamities of so many years.

When by the late king some relaxation was given us, what arts and insinuations have been used with us to draw us into a concurrence to designs tending to the prejudice of the nation? And with how little effect upon the generality of us it must be great ignorance not to know, and great injustice to deny.

But he that knoweth all things knoweth that though in such circumstances there was no opportunity for our receiving public and authorised promises when we were all under the eye of watchful jealousy; yet as great assurances as were possible were given us by some that we hope will now remember it, of a future established security from our former pressures. We were told over and over, when the excellent Heer Fagel's letter came to be privately communicated from hand to hand, how easily better things would be had for us, than that encouraged papists to expect, if ever that happy change should be brought about, which none have now beheld with greater joy than we.

We are loth to injure those who have made us hope for better by admitting a suspicion that we shall now be disappointed and deceived, (as we have formerly been, and we know by whom,) or that we shall suffer from them a *religious slavery*, for whose sakes we have suffered so grievous things, rather than do the least thing that might tend to the bringing upon them a *civil slavery*.

We cannot but expect from Englishmen that they be just and true. We hope not to be the only instances whereby the *Anglica Fides* and the *Punica* shall be thought all one.

But if we, who have constantly desired, and as we have had opportunity, endeavoured the saving of the nation, must however be ruined, not to greaten (one hair) the wealth and dignity of it, but only to gratify the humour of them who would yet destroy it; we who are competently inured to sufferings, shall through GOD's mercy be again enabled to endure; but He that sits in the heavens will in his own time judge our cause, and we will wait his pleasure; and we hope suffer all that can be inflicted, rather than betray the cause of reformed christianity in the world.

But our affairs are in the hands of men of worth and honour, who apprehend how little grateful a name they should leave to posterity, or obtain now with good men of any persuasion, if under a pretence of kindness to us, they should now repeat the arts of ill men in an ill time. Great minds will think it beneath them to sport themselves with their own cunning in deceiving other men; which were really in the present case too thin not to be seen through, and may be the easy attainment of any man that hath enough of opportunity, and integrity little enough for such purposes. And it is as much too gross to endeavour to abuse the authority of a nation, by going about to make that sloop to so mean a thing as to make a shew of intending what they resolve to their utmost shall never be.

But some may think by concessions to us the church of England will be ruined, and a great advantage given to the bringing in of popery.

To which we say, the generality of dissenters differ from the church of England in no substantials of doctrine and worship, no nor of government, provided it be so managed as to attain its true acknowledged end: the favouring of us therefore will as much ruin the church as its enlargement and additional strength will signify to its ruin.

And doth not the world know, that wherein we differ from them, we differ from the papists too? And that for the most part wherein they differ from us, they seem to agree with them?

We acknowledge their strong, brave, and prosperous opposition to popery; but they have opposed it by the things wherein they agree with us. The differences from us are no more a fence against popery, than an inclosure of straw is against a flame of fire.

But it is wont to be said we agree not among ourselves, and know not what we would have.

And do all that go under the name of the church of England agree among themselves? We can shew more considerable disagreements among them than any can between the most of us, and a considerable part of them. They all agree, it is true, in conformity; and we all agree in nonconformity. And is not this merely accidental to christianity and protestantism? And herein is it not well known that the far greater part of reformed christendom do more agree with us?

An arbitrary line of uniformity in some little accidents severs a small part of the christian world from all the rest. How unreasonably is it expected that therefore all the rest must in every thing else agree among themselves? Suppose any imaginary line to cut off a little segment from any part of the terrestrial globe; it is as justly expected that all the rest should be of one mind. If one part of England be tailors, they might as well expect that all the people besides should agree to be of one profession.

Perhaps some imagine it dishonourable to such as have gone before them in the same ecclesiastical stations and dignities, if now any thing should be altered, which their judgment did before approve and think fit.

But we hope that temptation will not prove invincible, viz. of so excessive a modesty as to be afraid of seeming wiser, or better natured, or of a more christian temper, than their predecessors.

But the most of us do agree not only with one another, but in the great things above-mentioned with the *church of England too*: and in short, that the reproach may cease for ever with those that count it one, they will find with us, when they please to try, a very extensive agreement on the terms of King Charles II'd's declaration about ecclesiastical affairs in 1660.

Q. 4. Whether it be reasonable to exclude all that in every thing conform not to the church of England, from any part or share of the civil power?

A. The difference or nonconformity of many is so minute that it would be as reasonable to exclude all whose hair is not of this or that colour. And what if we should make a determination by the decision this way or that of any other disputed question that may be of as small concernment to religion? Suppose it be that of *eating blood*, for the decision whereof one way there is more pretence from GOD's word, than for any point of the disputed conformity: would it not be a wise constitution, that *whosoever thinks it lawful to eat black-pudding shall be capable of no office, &c.*

But we tremble to think of the *exclusive sacramental test*, brought down as low as to the keeper of an alehouse. Are all fit to approach the sacred table, whom the fear of ruin or hope of gain may bring thither? We cannot but often remember with horror what happened three or four years ago; a man that led an ill life, but frequented the church, was observed not to come to the sacrament, and pressed by the officers to come; he yet declined, knowing

himself unfit; at length being threatened and terrified he came, but said to some present at the time of the solemn action, that he came only to avoid being undone, and took them to witness that what he there received he took only as common bread and wine, not daring to receive them as the body and blood of Christ. It is amazing that among christians so venerable an institution should be prostituted to the serving of so mean purposes, and so foreign to its true end! And that doing it after the manner of the church of England must be the qualification! As if *England* were another christendom; or it were a greater thing to conform in every punctilio to the rules of this church than of Christ himself!

But we would fain know whose is that holy table? Is it the table of this or that party, or the LORD's table? If the LORD's, are not persons to be admitted or excluded upon his terms? Never can there be union or peace in the christian world, till we take down our arbitrary inclosures, and content ourselves with those which our common Lord hath set. If he fall under a curse that alters a man's landmark, to alter GOD's is not likely to infer a blessing.

The matter is clear as the light of the sun, that as many persons of excellent worth, sobriety, and godliness, are entirely in the communion of the church of England, so there are too many of a worse character that are of it too; and divers prudent, pious, and sober-minded persons that are not of it. Let common reason be consulted in this case. Suppose the tables turned, and that the rule were to be made the contrary way, viz. that to do this thing, but not by any means after the manner of the church of England, were to be the qualification; and now suppose one of meaner endowments, as a man and a christian, do what is required, and not in the way of the church of England; and another that is much better, does the same thing in that way; were it suitable to prudence or justice, that be-

cause it is done after the way of the church of England, a fitter man should be reckoned unqualified, and one of less value be taken qualified, because he does it a different way? Then is all that solid weight of wisdom, diligence, sobriety, and goodness, to be weighed down by a feather.

It must surely be thought the prudence of any government to comprehend as many useful persons as it can, and no more to deprive itself of the service of such for any thing less considerable than those qualifications are by which they are useful, than a man would tear off from himself the limbs of his body for a spot on the skin.

And really if in our circumstances we thus narrow our interests, all the rest of the world will say, that they who would destroy us do yet find a way to be our instructors, and our common enemies do teach us our politics.

P. S. The names of Mr. Hales, of Eton college, and of a latter most renowned bishop of the church of England, who asserted this principle, that *if things be imposed under the notion of indifferent, which many think sinful, and a schism follow thereupon, the imposers are the schismatics*, will be great in England, as long as their writings shall live, and good sense can be understood in them.

NUMBER II. to Page 20.

An Abstract of the Reasons for and against the Bill of Union.

I. *The Reasons for the Bill.*

THIS Bill was commonly spoken of under the less proper name of a *comprehension*; and was intended, not as prejudice represented it, to break the frame of the church, but to give it strength and firmness. No altera-

tion was meant, but in points declared by the church itself, (see the preface to the Book of Common-Prayer,) to be alterable; while the essential part of the doctrine, government, and worship of the church was to be preserved entire. The alterations were to be made upon the grounds of prudence and charity, to restore what had been abused to its proper use, and to revise and improve the composition of its services. It had been through all times the custom of the christian church, not excepting the church of Rome itself, to change its offices in all ages, without incurring the censure of inconstancy. Condescensions in accommodating things to scrupulous minds had been promised, and were necessary to remove from the church the imputation of persecution. At such a distance from the Reformation, after so many revolutions, and after so many objections had been brought forward and considered, a review of the constitution was become seasonable, and could be more easily directed to a determinate point than formerly; and it was the only way to remove the scruples of dissenters. It could not undermine the church, as it was not to be made without the sanction of ecclesiastical power. It would not take away, as was feared, its fences; for after the essentials and conveniences of religion are provided for, unity and numbers are, under God, the strongest fences. Fences, which, as hitherto, were always attacked and perpetually called for defence, had more trouble than security in them. Concessions, fit in themselves, and made for the peace of the church, would not encourage demands of further concessions, but would justify to the world a refusal of them. Should the concessions not be received, it would leave those inexcusable who would advance when the friends of the church were bound and could not meet them; and when the church could, and came forward, ran back to their old extremes of averfation.

The Bill, it was urged, was so framed as to give all reasonable satisfaction to the dissenters.

As to ministers, the forms of subscription and ordaining were to be so adjusted that those who were episcopally ordained might come into parochial cures without scruple at that which was to be required. For them who had episcopal orders, such a provision was to be made as would satisfy all the ministers of foreign churches, and it was hoped would satisfy the English dissenters.

As to the laity, things indifferent in their own nature were to be left indifferent; and the grand objection of their being made unlawful by imposition would be entirely removed: so that whether used or not used, there would for the future be no bar against lay communion. Though it may be feared, that they who cover interest under the pretence of conscience, and some few pastors of wealthy congregations, might be tempted to desire a continuance of the distance between dissenters and the churchmen, yet they had more charitable thoughts of the sincere dissenters; and a confident expectation was entertained that the Bill, as offering terms full of christian moderation, and adapted to unite protestants, would certainly meet with the approbation of foreign protestants, who look upon the church of England as the center of protestant unity; as, indeed, they had testified by letters from Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, and other places; and those of them in England had in conversation expressed their satisfaction. And while it would at present have its effect with sincere dissenters, though it should not succeed with all, it would secure the next generation who would not have those prejudices instilled into them, which the public law would take away.

It was supposed that had the Ushers, Sanderfons, Hammonds, and others of the most worthy men of the last age, been alive, the Bill of Union would have had their

cordial support. It was even then approved by the truest sons of the church. It would, though there were not a dissenter in the nation, be the interest of the church to propose such a bill. The constitution of the church would be improved by giving some of its offices a greater solemnity; by additional prayers, hymns, and lessons; and by some new offices for cases for which none were provided. One juncture for such a measure had been lost at the return of Charles II. A new and favourable one now offered from the league at that time between the protestant princes and states.

See "A Letter in defence of the Bill for Uniting of Protestants, from a Divine to a Member of Parliament," printed in 1689, and licensed by the Earl of Shrewsbury's command April 1; and preserved in the *State-Tracts* of King William III. vol. ii. p. 71, &c.

II. *Reasons against the Bill.*

A Reply to the preceding was published, entitled, "A Letter from a Member of Parliament in answer to the letter of the Divine concerning the Bill for uniting Protestants."

The writer did not object to the word *comprehension*, nor was he disposed to reject all proposals of alteration; but would be glad to see the good old house improved. He was not so unreasonable as to say that all the appointments of the church were unalterable; but would grant that they were capable of amendment, and would be so even after the intended amendments and supplies.

It is granted, that condescensions were promised; but such as would meet the approbation of a parliament and convocation; and that a bill of toleration, without one

of comprehension, was sufficient to remove the charge of persecution from the church.

Yet his judgment was for a review of the constitution; but that would be "a bill of discreet charity," indeed, which would take away all scruples, prevent all prejudices, and reduce the nation to perfect union.

The ecclesiastical power which he and all divines of his acquaintance desired, was the power of hearing and deliberating concerning the proposed alterations in convocation. He had various objections against the plan designed, that twenty divines under a royal commission should consider and determine of the alterations to be presented afterwards to Parliament; he hoped also to the convocation. The ecclesiastical community, he thought, should be represented, not by a few men of a sort, but by a convention at least of their own choice.

The natural and secure fence against false doctrines and divisions in the church was, he thought, an approbation required from every minister of the church to what is ordered in it; for if he scruples to say he approves the doctrine, he is not to be trusted with the teaching of it; and if he approve not the discipline, he will practise it untowardly.

That leaving the use of the ceremonies indifferent, and at the choice and judgment of the ministers or the laity, each for himself, would introduce such discordant practices, some observing, others omitting them; that though the church might grow numerous by taking dissenters in, it would be no stronger than an army that filled up its companies with mutineers.

His judgment was, that the House, *i. e.* the Commons, would not yield to the proposals, and that the dissenters would refuse an acquiescence in them, and that books against episcopacy and the liturgy would still fly about; that, therefore, the church should perfect herself as she

can, in the best manner for the service of God and the edification of the people, and commit the event to the Divine Providence.

He asked, why might not the few pastors of wealthy congregations be provided for by church preferments? This would be a less chargeable gratification to them, than to expose the church, for their pretended ease, to immediate disorders and factions: that the church was not so ill provided as to want their ministers: that if after competent study they really continued to think the ceremonies unlawful, it was to him such a proof of their weakness, as that they ought not to undertake to teach, but should modestly be contented with lay communion.

He granted that a great tenderness was due to the laity, as they took up prejudices from the wrong information of those, who, pretending to instruct them, ought to know better; having not leisure, capacity, or opportunity of correcting their prejudices. The imposition of the ceremonies of kneeling at the sacrament, and of the sign of the cross, and the use of the surplice, as to them, should be dispensed with.

As to the approbation of foreign protestant churches, they would hardly admit into their churches a man who should deny to approve their doctrines and discipline; they kept to their own rules, not, it is to be supposed, from humour and opposition, but upon wise consideration, and for the sake of order and peace. A Calvinist minister may be glad that he may be considered as capable of English preferment, and may write such a letter of compliment to get one; but this is neither authority nor motive for our change; and “what need is there for a
“foreign oracle, or going to Switzerland for a direction
“for us in England? Shall strangers be supposed to know
“our circumstances better than we? And shall we never
“think ourselves able to do our own business ourselves?”

He was glad that the church of England was looked upon as the center of protestant unity : such he hoped she would prove : that she seemed already to have the proper position for this office, and would, if she vary much, go out of her true place ; for so much as she approached to the Calvinist, so far she departed from the Lutheran church, as friendly and a much more considerable body : that if she would be a center, she must be fixed somewhere ; for she could never be serviceable to those abroad, if she were in disorder and confusion at home. And that we should be guided by the standing consideration of unity and peace at home, and not by the temporary conjunction of princes and states, which may alter the next year.

That he knew many, and those not inconsiderable, friends to the church against the bill as it was reported to be framed, and who thought it highly for the cause of the church to have it amended.

Though there be reasons for improvement, though peace and piety may be promoted, which is granted, it should be regularly considered, and not done by a few friends, and on their own head. The prudence of the grand change designed is the more suspected, as there was great reason to dislike the preparatory expedient.

One cause that the juncture in Charles II'd's reign was lost, was the extravagance of the dissenters' proposals. Some were stiff for every tittle of the old form, and some were more unreasonable against the whole. The fanatics and the papists were for no settlement at all. For fear the juncture should be entirely lost, it was thought adviseable to resolve upon the present establishment.

That the church, though it be not absolutely perfect, is more perfect than any other in the christian world. The papists would take advantage of our discords. He would have the bill so framed as not to occasion their doing it. " The church," he said, " without the dissenters, and

“ united as she is in herself, has been able to make a glorious stand against popery regnant; but if by the admission of dissenters she shall be broken and divided, she may grow weaker by her new company, and not resist so successfully a second time.”

The season might be favourable, but that did not arise from the protestant league abroad; for what breach of any articles of that league would it be, if the church remained unaltered; or how doth the league enabled us to make ever the better alterations. Circumstances at home render the season favourable, if we who were almost comprehended in the ruin, we at least who were united in the defence of our religion, would abate of our stiffness for or against smaller matters, and would be ready to form such a body as may be more firm and lasting.

NUMBER III.

Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and about London, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational; not as a measure for any National Constitution, but for the Preservation of Order in our Congregations, that cannot come up to the common rule by law established.

I. Of Churches and Church Members.

1. WE acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ to have one catholick church, or kingdom, comprehending all that are united to him whether in heaven or earth: and do conceive the whole multitude of visible

believers, and their infant seed, (commonly called the catholic visible church) to belong to Christ's spiritual kingdom in this world : but for the notion of a catholic visible church here, as it signifies its having been collected into any formed society, under a visible human head on earth, whether one person singly, or many collectively, we, with the rest of *protestants*, unanimously disclaim it.

2. We agree, that particular societies of visible saints, who under Christ their head are statedly joined together for ordinary communion with one another in all the ordinances of Christ, are particular churches, and are to be owned by each other, as instituted churches of Christ, though differing in apprehensions and practices in some lesser things.

3. That none shall be admitted as members, in order to communion in all the special ordinances of the gospel, but such persons as are knowing and sound in the fundamental doctrines of the christian religion, without scandal in their lives ; and to a judgment regulated by the word of GOD, are persons of visible godliness and honesty, credibly professing cordial subjection to Jesus Christ.

4. A competent number of such visible saints (as before described) do become the capable subjects of stated communion in all the special ordinances of Christ, upon their mutual declared consent and agreement to walk together herein according to gospel rule. In which declaration, different degrees of explicitness shall no way hinder such churches from owning each other as instituted churches.

5. Though parochial bounds be not of divine right, yet for common edification, the members of a particular church ought (as much as conveniently may be) to live near one another.

6. That each particular church hath right to chuse their own officers ; and being furnished with such as are duly qualified and ordained according to the gospel rule, hath

authority from Christ for exercising government, and of enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself.

7. In the administration of church power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church (if such there be) to rule and govern ; and to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the gospel.

8. That all professors, as before described, are bound in duty, as they have opportunity, to join themselves as fixed members of some particular church ; their thus joining being part of their professed subjection to the gospel of Christ, and an instituted means of their establishment and edification ; whereby they are under the pastoral care, and in case of scandalous or offensive walking, may be authoritatively admonished or censured for their recovery, and for vindication of the truth, and the church professing it.

9. That a visible professor thus joined to a particular church, ought to continue steadfastly with the said church ; and not forsake the ministry and ordinances there dispensed, without an orderly seeking a recommendation to another church : which ought to be given, when the case of the person apparently requires it.

II. *Of the Ministry.*

1. We agree, that the ministerial office is instituted by Jesus Christ, for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church ; and to continue to the end of the world.

2. They who are called to this office, ought to be endued with competent learning and ministerial gifts ; as also with the grace of God, sound in judgment, not novices in the faith and knowledge of the gospel ; without scandal, of holy conversation, and such as devote themselves to the work and service thereof.

3 That ordinarily none shall be ordained to the work of this ministry, but such as are called and chosen thereunto by a particular church.

4. That in so great and weighty a matter, as the calling and chusing a pastor, we judge it ordinarily requisite, that every such church consult and advise with the pastors of neighbouring congregations.

5. That after such advice, the person consulted about, being chosen by the brotherhood of that particular church over which he is to be set, and he accepting, be duly ordained, and set apart to his office over them ; wherein it is ordinarily requisite, that the pastors of neighbouring congregations concur with the preaching elder or elders, if such there be.

6. That whereas such ordination is only intended for such as never before had been ordained to the ministerial office ; if any judge, that in the case also of the removal of one formerly ordained, to a new station or pastoral charge, there ought to be a like solemn recommending him and his labours to the grace and blessing of GOD ; no different sentiments or practice herein shall be any occasion of contention or breach of communion among us.

7. It is expedient, that they who enter on the work of preaching the gospel, be not only qualified for communion of saints ; but also that, except in cases extraordinary, they give proof of their gifts and fitness for the said work unto the pastors of churches, of known abilities to discern and judge of their qualifications : that they may be sent forth with solemn approbation and prayer, which we judge needful, that no doubt may remain concerning their being called to the work ; and for preventing (as much as in us lies) ignorant and rash intruders.

III. *Of Censures.*

1. As it cannot be avoided, but that in the purest churches on earth, there will sometimes offences and scandals arise by reason of hypocrisy and prevailing corruption; so Christ hath made it the duty of every church to reform itself by spiritual remedies appointed by him to be applied in all such cases, viz. admonition and excommunication.

2. Admonition, being the rebuking of an offending member in order to conviction, is, in case of private offences, to be performed according to the rule in Matth. xviii. 15, 16, 17: and in case of publick offences, openly before the church, as the honour of the gospel and nature of the scandal shall require: and if either of the admonitions take place for the recovery of the fallen person, all further proceedings in a way of censure are thereupon to cease, and satisfaction to be declared accordingly.

3. When all due means are used, according to the order of the gospel, for the restoring an offending and scandalous brother, and he notwithstanding remains impenitent, the censure of excommunication is to be proceeded unto; wherein the pastor and other elders (if there be such) are to lead and go before the church, and the brotherhood to give their consent, in a way of obedience unto Christ, and unto the elders, as over them in the lord.

4. It may sometimes come to pass, that a church member, not otherwise scandalous, may sinfully withdraw, and divide himself from the communion of the church to which he belongeth; in which case, when all due means for the reducing him prove ineffectual; he having hereby cut himself off from that church's communion, the church may justly esteem and declare itself discharged of any further inspection over him,

IV. *Of Communion of Churches.*

1. We agree, that particular churches ought not to walk so distinct and separate from each other as not to have care and tendernefs towards one another : but their pastors ought to have frequent meetings together, that by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they may strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord.

2. That none of our particular churches shall be subordinate to one another, each being endued with equality of power from Jesus Christ : and that none of the said particular churches, their officer or officers, shall exercise any power or have any superiority over any other church or their officers.

3. That known members of particular churches, constituted as aforesaid, may have occasional communion with one another in the ordinances of the gospel, viz. the word, prayer, sacraments, singing psalms, dispensed according to the mind of Christ ; unless that church with which they desire communion, hath any just exception against them.

4. That we ought not to admit any one to be a member of our respective congregations, that hath joined himself to another, without endeavours of mutual satisfaction of the congregations concerned.

5. That one church ought not to blame the proceedings of another, till it hath heard what that church charged, its elders or messengers, can say in vindication of themselves from any charge of irregular or injurious proceedings.

6. That we are most willing and ready to give an account of our church proceedings to each other when desired, for preventing or removing any offences, that may arise among us. Likewise, we shall be ready to give

the right hand of fellowship, and walk together according to the gospel rules of communion of churches.

V. Of Deacons and Ruling Elders.

We agree, the office of a deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to their office to receive, lay out, and distribute the church's stock to its proper uses, by the direction of the pastor and elders, if such there be. And whereas divers are of opinion that there is also the office of ruling elders, who labour not in word and doctrine; and others think otherwise, we agree that this difference make no breach among us.

VI. Of Synods.

1. We agree, that in order to concord, and in any other weighty and difficult cases, it is needful, and according to the mind of Christ, that a synod be called to consult and advise about such matters.

2. That a synod may consist of smaller or greater numbers, as the matter shall require.

3. That particular churches, their respective elders and members, ought to have a reverential regard to the judgment of such synods, and not dissent therefrom, without apparent grounds from the word of God.

VII. Of our Demeanour towards the Civil Magistrate.

1. We do reckon ourselves obliged continually to pray for God's protection, guidance, and blessing upon the rulers set over us.

2. That we ought to yield unto them not only subjection in the Lord, but support, according to our station and abilities.

3. That if at any time it shall be their pleasure to call together any number of us, or require any account of our affairs, and the state of our congregations, we shall most readily express all dutiful regard to them herein.

VIII. *Of a Confession of Faith.*

As to what appertains to soundness of judgment in matters in faith, we esteem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the scriptures to be the word of GOD, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice ; and own either the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession, or Catechisms, shorter or larger, compiled by the assembly at Westminster, or the confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said rule.

IX. *Of our Duty and Department towards them that are not in communion with us.*

1. We judge it our duty to bear a christian respect to fellow christians, according to their several ranks and stations, that are not of our persuasion of communion.

2. As for such as may be ignorant of the principles of the christian religion, or of vicious conversation, we shall in our respective places, as they give us opportunity, endeavour to explain to them the doctrine of life and salvation, and to our uttermost persuade them to be reconciled to GOD.

3. That such who appear to have the essential requisites to church communion, we shall willingly receive them in the LORD, not troubling them with disputes about lesser matters.

NUMBER IV.

Dissenters' Address on the Death of Queen Mary.

May it please your Majesty,

THOUGH we come in the rear of the train of mourners to pay our tributary tears for the invaluable loss in the death of your royal consort, and our most gracious queen, yet our resentments of it are with as tender a sympathy as are in the breasts of any of your subjects. This gives the sharpest accent to our passions, that the considerations which are most proper and powerful to allay our sorrows, exasperate them; for while we remember what she was, how general and diffusive a blessing to three kingdoms, the severe stroke of Providence in taking her from us is most afflicting. Such a concurrence of high perfection shined in her person and actions, that would have made her illustrious in a low condition; and in her exalted station, they were attractive of the eyes and admiration of all. Her mind was above the temptations that attend the throne. Majesty was mixed with that condescending humility, that tender and beneficent goodness, that she was easily accessible to all for their relief and support. Her piety and purity were so conspicuous, her affections were so composed and temperate, that the court, that is usually the centre of vanity and voluptuousness, became virtuous by the impression of her example. Her conversation was so regular, that her enemies (if goodness in such bright eminency had any) could not fasten a taint upon her. Her royal endowments for government, wisdom, magnanimity, vigilance, and care in managing affairs of state, (without which the highest princes are but civil idols, useless and unprofitable to the world,) these were in such a degree of excellency, that in your Majesty's

constrained absence, while you were defending the interest of christendom against a potent enemy abroad, with the sword of war, she sweetly ordered all things at home with the sceptre of peace. She is gone, and must return no more: oh, astonishing grief! But it becomes us with humble submission to acquiesce in the divine disposal. The will of GOD is always directed by infinite wisdom, and is the rule of goodness. We must refresh our sorrows with the hope that she is entered into her Saviour's joy, whom she imitated and honoured; and that she is made happy in the love of GOD, and the light of his countenance for ever.

We humbly beseech your Majesty to accept the renewed assurances of our inviolable and constant fidelity to your person and government; and that we shall influence all that are within our compass to persevere in their duty; we shall earnestly pray to the blessed GOD to keep you in the best protection, his encompassing favour; to support your spirit with divine comforts; and to continue long your precious life, so necessary for preserving the pure religion, and the civil rights of this kingdom.

NUMBER V.

Lists of Students educated in the different Seminaries, of which an account has been given, from page 225 to page 261.

I. to Page 230. *Mr. Woodhouse's Pupils.*

Sir Edward Harley's two sons, viz.

1. Robert, afterwards Earl of Oxford, born in London in 1661; he died in 1724. His name the history of this country has transmitted to us with celebrity as a statesman and a political character, and as a liberal patron of learning and a great collector of books; his MSS. are preserved in the British Museum.

2. Auditor Harley.

3. Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, born at Battersea in 1672, where he died 1751. He secured to himself great and permanent honours by his political career under three reigns, and by his works, composed in a neat and flowing style, and dictated by a fine and vigorous genius, though unhappily warped by inveterate prejudices against christianity.

3. Thomas Foley, esq; afterwards Lord Foley.

4. *** Leechmere, esq.

5. Thomas Hunt, esq; of Boreaton, Shropshire; the feat of an honourable and worthy family, spoken off with great respect in the lives of the Henries, father and son.

6. T. Winnington.

7. Mr. Yates, of Deanford, who in 1674 was the only surviving student educated at Sheriff-Hales.

The following gentlemen who received academical learning at that seminary, appeared afterwards in the character of ministers:

8. Mr. Rob. Travers, who, in 1715, was settled at Lichfield, and preached at Long near that city, where he settled 27th Sept. 1692.

9. Mr. John Norris, a preacher of singular talents, and a man of a generous, candid, and benevolent temper, and of amiable piety; who died at Welford in Northamptonshire, Feb. 8, 1738, in the 63d year of his age, where he

had been a minister of a church, originally collected and formed by him, near thirty-eight years, having declined, in the mean time, earnest and unanimous invitations from very considerable congregations at Birmingham and Nottingham. He died suddenly, as he was going from one apartment of his house to another; he preached on the preceding Sunday, and concluded the public services, as if he had a presentiment that he was then taking his farewell, with a pious, lively, and affectionate prayer for his people. Doddridge's Sermons and Tracts, vol. i. p. 151—155, 12mo.

10. Mr. Chewning Blackmore, son of Mr. Wm. Blackmore, M. A. of Lincoln college, Oxford, ejected from St. Peter's, Cornhill; scribe to the provincial assembly in London; and for his loyalty to Charles II. imprisoned in the Tower under the protectorate; but on his parole by the influence of his elder brother Sir John Blackmore with Cromwell. Mr. Chewning Blackmore settled with a congregation of protestant dissenters in the city of Worcester, of which he was many years the pastor; and died

about the year 1742, leaving the character of a truly valuable person, highly esteemed for his singular talents and abilities by his brethren in the ministry.

11. Mr. William Willets, who settled at Dudley in Worcestershire, and died of a decline about the year 1702. Dr. Calamy has enrolled his name in a list of the worthies of the day. Vol. ii. preface, p. xxxii.

12. Mr. Daniel Greenwood, who was first settled at West-Bromwich, Staffordshire, and then minister in connection with Mr. Turton, of the first congregation of protestant dissenters in Birmingham, called from its situation the higher, and which now bears the name of the old, meeting.

13. Mr. George Flower, a native of Burton-upon-Trent. In 1696 he became domestic chaplain to Mr. Foley; in 1698 he was chosen minister of the congregation of protestant dissenters formed that year in the town of Stourbridge in Worcestershire, of which he remained the pastor till his death in 1733, in the 60th year of his age. He was a man of considerable accomplishments, and of an amiable temper, and

in his character the scholar, the gentleman, and the christian were gracefully united. *Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Bourn*, p. 275, &c.

14. Mr. John Spilsbury, son of Mr. John Spilsbury, M. A. fellow of Magdalen college, Oxford, and ejected from Bromsgrove in Worcestershire; and on the maternal side, nephew of Dr. John Hall, bishop of Bristol, who appointed him his executor. He was thirty-three years pastor of the congregation of dissenters at Kidderminster, whose place of worship was erected for him. He died Jan. 31, 1727, aged 60. "A graceful and familiar address from the pulpit," says Dr. Latham, "and wise, prudent conduct out of it, gave him great weight and influence in the place of his residence." His son,

Mr. Francis Spilsbury, an amiable and respectable character, sustained the ministerial office, as pastor of the congregation of dissenters at Salters' Hall, London, for forty years, with a dignified propriety and singular acceptance; and died March 3, 1782, aged 77.

15. Mr. James Warner, who settled at Tewkesbury.

16. Mr. John Newman, a native of Oxfordshire, and born about the year 1676. He began to preach when he was about nineteen years of age, and in 1696 was chosen assistant to the Rev. Nath. Taylor at Salters' Hall, and was elected co-pastor of the same congregation with Mr. Tong in 1706. During the long period of forty-five years he supported his connection with this society with usefulness and reputation. See *Wilson's Dissenting Churches*, vol. ii. p. 33—36.

17. Mr. *** Hayley; who settled in Leominster, and died in 1719.

18. Mr. Edward Oasland, who was in 1715 minister of the congregation at Bewdley in Worcestershire; from the living of which town his father, Mr. Henry Oasland, an active, fervent, and acceptable minister, had been ejected.

19. Mr. Benj. Robinsone, who succeeded Mr. Woodhouse in Little St. Helen's, London, of whom we have spoken before, p. 251—253.

20. Mr. Joseph Stokes, who succeeded Mr. Willets at Dudley; and died pastor of the dissenting congregation in that town in 1743.

21. Mr. Benjamin Bennet, born at Willborough, a village near Market-Bosworth, in the county of Leicester, in 1674; he commenced his ministry in a small congregation at Temple-Hall, a village near the place of his nativity; and in 1699 was invited to succeed Dr. Gilpin at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where he died Sept. 1, 1726. His works, especially his “*Memorial of the Reformation*,” the “*Irenicum*,” and the “*Christian Oratory*,” have transmitted to us honourable testimonials of his piety and temper, his talents and character. For more particulars see the *Monthly Repository*, vol. ii. p. 341, 453; and *Memoirs of him* prefixed to the late respectable Mr. Samuel Palmer’s edition of the *Christian Oratory*.

22. Mr. Richard Carver, who was ordained minister of the congregation at Stretton in Warwickshire, and remained in that connection in 1715.

23. Mr. Ruffel, near Wolverhampton.

24. Mr. James Thompson, minister of the dissenting congregation at Bromsgrove, where he died in 1729. He was distinguished by holy zeal, vi-

vacity, and eagerness in the service of God, and the duties of the ministry.

25. Mr. John Warren, whom Dr. Latham characterises as the *polite and amiable* Mr. Warren, began his ministerial life in an agreeable retirement, as chaplain to Philip Foley, esq; Prestwood, near Kidderminster; and afterwards, for about fifty years, adorned a public station among the dissenters in Coventry; first as assistant to Mr. Tong; then as co-pastor with Mr. Joshua Merrel; and then as sole pastor till his death, at near seventy years of age, in 1742. He greatly excelled in the functions of his office. His mind was stored with theological knowledge. “The
“clearness of his thoughts,
“the propriety and freedom of
“his expressions, the justness
“of his method, and the de-
“cency of his elocution, all
“animated by a true sense of
“the importance of the things
“he delivered, rendered him
“a very entertaining and use-
“ful preacher: he had a happy
“talent in prayer, and was
“assiduous in all pastoral duties.
“On the day before his death
“he declared to a friend, ‘I
“‘have that peace and comfort

“ “I would not be without for
“ “a world.”—Protestant Dis-
senter's Magazine, vol. v. for
1798, p. 282.

26. Mr. Warren, settled at
Burbick, Wilts.

27. Mr. Ferdinando Shaw,
the son of the excellent Mr.
Samuel Shaw, M. A. of St.
John's college, Cambridge, and
ejected from the rectory of
Long-Whatton, Leicestershire;
he settled with a congregation
of protestant dissenters in the
town of Derby, of which he was
for forty-six years the pastor.
His character was drawn in the
town print of the day as that of
a gentleman of great worth,
and endued with many christian
virtues; patient under many
years confinement and the most
acute pains, and, during any
mitigation of the paroxysms, of
a cheerful and agreeable tem-
per. Notwithstanding his bo-
dily infirmities, he was diligent
and faithful in his ministry.
His manners to all were affable
and courteous. His charities
to the poor were generous and
extensive, not confined within
the narrow boundaries of any
particular sect, and liberal to his
utmost power. His amiable
virtues gained him universal
esteem and good will. He died

the 20th of Jan. 1743, aged 72.
His funeral sermon was preached
previously to his interment by
the Rev. Joseph Rogerfon, and
he was followed to his grave, in
the parish church of St. Wer-
burgh, by his congregation;
his pall was supported by
six ministers of the neighbour-
hood, viz. Dr. Latham, of Fin-
dern, Mr. Rogerfon, Derby,
Mr. Murray, Burton-upon-
Trent, Mr. Walton, Castle-
Donnington, Mr. Peat, Wirk-
sworth, and Mr. Gregory, of
Findern. N. B. These par-
ticulars are taken from the
Derby Mercury, vol. xiii. num.
47, communicated by Mr.
Peyton, of Birmingham, on the
maternal side descended from
Mr. Shaw. The eulogium on
his character was echoed by the
pen of a clergyman in elegiac
lines, in the Gentleman's Ma-
gazine for February 1745.

28. Mr. Samuel Philips, who
settled with a congregation at
Bromyard, and died there 1721.

29. Mr. Matthew Clark, an
eminent minister among the
Independents, son of the Rev.
Matthew Clarke, ejected from
Narborough in Leicestershire,
was born 2d Feb. 1664; where,
on the commencement of his
ministerial character, he first

assisted his father for three years, and laid the foundation of several dissenting churches. He then spent two years with a congregation at Sandwich in Kent. About 1690 he accepted an invitation from an independent congregation, Miles's-lane, London. He continued his connection with this society till his death, March 27, 1726, aged 62. Much beloved and much lamented, an admired and useful preacher, leaving behind him at his death one of the most numerous and flourishing congregations in the metropolis; he was ranked among the best and most useful divines of the age in which he lived; and united in his character, to an eminent degree, the gentleman and the christian. See a full memoir of him in Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. p. 474—491.

30. Mr. John Ratcliffe, born in 1677, commenced his academical studies under Mr. Woodhouse, which he afterwards pursued and finished under Mr. Lorimer, Mr. Spademan, and Mr. Oldfield, near London. He was descended from a family belonging to the established church; but becoming acquainted with some serious dissenters in

his youth, and meeting with some of their practical works, particularly Baxter's Saint's Rest, his mind received deep impressions of piety, and he was led to examine the reasons of dissent, and was determined to adhere to its principles. When he had finished his academical studies, his residence was for some time in Essex. Here he fell into a depression of spirits and a religious distress of mind; which induced him to consult some eminent ministers in London; first by letter, and then to remove to the city for the benefit of free and frequent personal intercourse with them. The gentlemen, to whom he fully opened his heart, were Mr. Sylvester, Mr. Howe, Mr. Spademan, and Mr. Shower; the event was the happy settlement of his mind. At this time the death of Mr. Stancliff, at Rotherhithe, and an occasional sermon he preached there, opened the way for an harmonious invitation to become the pastor of the congregation; to which office he was solemnly ordained in 1705, and continued in it for nearly twenty-three years, with constant and indefatigable application to its duties, till his death on the 16th

Feb. 1728. He was exemplary in conduct, and remarkable for universal benevolence, formed upon truly generous and catholic principles, as well as for the pious seriousness of his spirit. His catechetical exercises, began in the year 1707 and continued to the year 1715, formed an eminent part of his ministerial labours. He first entered upon them with a small number of catechumens in his house. On a strong disposition expressed by many to attend them, and by other public spirited persons to encourage and patronize them, he removed them to his place of worship, and devoted every Monday to this service from five o'clock in the morning to eight at night. Sometimes there were not fewer than 2000 on a day. The numbers thus instructed within the eight years were estimated at 10,000. The catechumens were young persons of all parties and denominations. The younger children recited the answers in the assembly's catechism; those of farther standing were employed in hearing them; others preserved order; and exact accounts of every one's proficiency and behaviour were returned. Mr. Ratcliffe after

this spent two hours in examining the grown youths upon the parts or sense of an answer, or more frequently of a text of scripture. He closed the service with some practical inferences, a pathetic exhortation adapted to the capacities and temptations of children, and an earnest prayer. After dinner the time was given to free and profitable conversation. The evening was spent in like endeavours with the other sex. Rewards were bestowed according to their proficiencies, to excite emulation. Among the rewards were Allen's Sure Guide, Baxter's Call, and, on the recital of the whole catechism, a bible. The expences incurred by these exercises were great, not less than 300l. a year, and sometimes they amounted to 4 or 500l. These were defrayed by stated subscriptions, and by considerable donations from unknown persons. Mr. Ratcliffe received no remuneration for all his incredible pains; but out of his own income, his though the circumstances of family would have justified his waving any pecuniary aid, he subscribed himself 10l. per annum. It should be mentioned to the honour of Mr. Ratcliffe,

as a consistent protestant, that though he used and valued the catechism particularly adopted by the dissenters, as a very useful summary of, in their judgment, christian principles, yet the Bible alone was his standard : this he inculcated upon the children. He was far from censuring others, when their apprehensions differed from his, and always expected to be allowed the liberty of judging about the sense of the Bible in the best manner he could. See his " funeral sermon," by Dr. John Evans, p. 24, 32.

N. B. The preceding list of Mr. Woodhouse's pupils is furnished by the late Mr. Josiah Thompson's " Account of the " Dissenting Academies," MS. at present *penes me*, p. 2. Mr. Thompson adds, that Mr. John Southwell, who was nephew to Mr. Rich. Southwell, ejected from the chapelry of Baswick in Staffordshire, and sometime assistant minister with Mr. Woodhouse at Dudley in Worcestershire, and who afterwards removed to Newbury in Berkshire, continued for some time the seminary of Sheriff Hales ; the names of two gentlemen only are given, as having studied under him ; viz.

1. William Harris, D. D. forty-two years pastor of the congregation of protestant dissenters in Crutched-Friars, a celebrated preacher, an eminent divine, and in high reputation as an author. He was reckoned the greatest master of the English tongue among the dissenters ; which was thought, by a good judge, to have derived some embellishments from his manner of writing. His compositions on divers subjects and occasions were laboured and finished. He was particularly a true friend and excellent pattern to young ministers, in preaching and conversation. He wrote with judgment in the deistical controversy with Woolston and Collins ; with the former in two discourses on " The reasonableness of believing in Christ, " and the unreasonableness of " Infidelity ; with brief Remarks " on the case of Lazarus ; " and with the latter, rather in way of reference than of direct answer to " The Grounds and " Reasons," in a volume of sermons, under the title of " Practical Discourses on the " principal representations of " the Messiah throughout the " Old Testament." It was a favourite observation with him,

that without some knowledge of scripture criticism, no man can thoroughly understand his Bible, or make a proper use of it. For a fuller memoir of this excellent character see Protestant Dissenters' Magazine for 1795, p. 217, &c. And Wilson's Dissenting Churches, vol. i. p. 66—77.

2. Mr. Thomas Leavesly, first pastor of a congregation at Little Baddow in Essex; and then, as successor to Mr. Simon Brown, at the Old Jewry, in London, from about 1723 to 1737; a man of excellent temper, and distinguished by a gift in prayer. He was one of the preachers of the lecture at Salters' Hall against popery, in 1735. See Wilson's Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. p. 358, 360.

P.S. It appears, from an article in the obituary of the Monthly Magazine for December 1797, p. 493, on the death

of Mr. John Southwell, November 22, in that year, in the 75th year of his age, the grandson of the tutor, that Mr. Thompson's account of him is not quite correct, any more than complete. It is there stated, that he, having been educated under Mr. Woodhouse, was successively chaplain to Philip Foley, of Bestwood, esq; assistant to Mr. Woodhouse, master of an academy at Kidderminster, which he removed to Dudley, and thence to Newbury; and died of a consumption, about 1694, aged about 32. His grandson was 33 years master of the grammar-school at Stafford: a correct and elegant scholar, and a man of distinguishing and amiable excellencies of character, who in the latter part of his life systematically cultivated cheerfulness, as a duty, and whose most favourite author was Jortin.

II. *Mr. Warren's Pupils.*

Besides Mr. Grove, the names of the following gentlemen are preserved, as having received academical learning under Mr. Warren.

1. Mr. John Enty, a native of Cornwall, the son of a taylor, who worked at the houses of his

customers, and who had begun to initiate the youth in the same employment; till being once at Tregothnan, the seat of the Boscawens, the indications he gave of intelligence and parts attracted the notice of Mrs. Fortescue, a lady, who was a

great friend of the dissenting cause, and induced her to take him under her patronage, and to support the expence of his education, first at a grammar-school, and then in his academical course; which he finished with the character of a bright and serious young man. He was invited to settle, as successor to Mr. Shirwell, with a congregation at Plymouth. Though the topics on which he discoursed were common and trite; yet the pains he is said to have bestowed on his compositions, a strong musical voice, a lively imagination, and a great command and flow of words, adapted to the taste of his hearers, pleased the ear and moved the passions. After the ejection of the great Mr. Peirce, he was chosen one of the ministers of the united congregations at Exeter, in 1720. At this time the dissenters thro' Devon and Cornwall were greatly agitated by the warmth with which the trinitarian controversy was carried on; and at the assembly of ministers, says my author, had “ set up a spiritual tyranny, and successfully “ and smoothly carried it on “ for many years under the “ cover of three words, *Agree-*

ment, Order, Decency.” Mr. Enty became a strenuous advocate for the orthodoxy of the day, and a leader in the transactions of the assembly; and all ecclesiastical affairs were directed by him with the applause of his friends, by whom he was much carested, but with a peculiar hauteur and contempt which provoked and disgusted others. But, in private circles, his manners were easy and free, and without any affectation of distance and gravity. He had a great ascendancy over his principal hearers, without prying into the secrets of families, or interfering in domestic affairs. He outlived the controversy, and survived his opponents, enjoying the peace, power, and reputation, which by a steadfast adherence to his party he had firmly established. An epidemic disease terminated his life about the end of the year 1743, and he met death with great composure and decency, taking a distinct and solemn leave of his family.—Mr. Fox's Lives of his old and particular friends; a MS. communicated by his grandson, Mr. George Cleather, of Stonehouse, near Plymouth.

N. B. Mr. Fox, a native of Plymouth, was a fellow student with Dr. Chandler, and Archbishop Secker, at Mr. Eames's. He was educated for the ministry, and preached once; but soon after lay aside the character, and afterwards conformed, as a layman.

2. Mr. Jacob Sandercock, who settled at Tavistock, Devon, in 1688, and was a character that carried great weight and authority. Fox's MS.

3. Mr. George Brett, who settled at Liskeard in Cornwall; "a genius, a man of a clear head and a great memory; able to talk off hand on any point, as if he had studied no other; his learning laid not only in divinity and history, but he was an acute philosopher; understood more of the grounds of physic than many who professed it; he had a taste for painting and music; he disclaimed the power assumed for some years by the Exeter assembly, and held in contempt the presbyterian hierarchy." Fox's MS. He settled at Liskeard about the year 1705, and was living in 1761. His grand-daughter by his only daughter and child,

married to Mr. John Weymouth of Exeter, was the first wife of the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, of that city.

4. Mr. Christopher Taylor, who, with a capacity sufficiently great and extensive to qualify him for any of the learned professions, chose to devote himself, under the difficulties and discouragements of the times, to the ministry among the dissenters; and in his academical course made a very considerable progress in rational and polite learning, which he afterwards cultivated and improved. He was solemnly ordained to the office of minister on the 25th August 1687, and was recommended to fill up a very public station at Bath; and in 1699 was invited to the service of the congregation in Hatton-Garden, London, where he discharged the pastoral office to their great satisfaction about twenty-four years; and scarcely any minister in the city was more constantly attended on, or more valued and regarded by his people: though his ministerial labours were chiefly confined to them, his usefulness was much more extensive, especially to the common welfare of protestant

dissenters ; and he was engaged by some of the best judges of men to act in some public transactions of great consequence both to Scotland and England, viz. those of the union of the two kingdoms, in 1707. On the completion of which, he preached and printed a thanksgiving sermon. He was zealous for the civil and religious liberties of mankind. He delivered his discourses as one deeply sensible of the weight of the service in which he was engaged, and greatly concerned

for the honour of God, and the edification of his hearers, with vigour and affection. He united in his character a quick apprehension, a sound judgment, and a good taste of things ; wisdom in council, and a considerable insight into the affairs of the world ; a large share of natural firmness and integrity, a steady honesty, and a true greatness and generosity of mind. He died on the 26th of October 1723.—The funeral sermon by Mr. Joshua Bayes.

III. *Mr. Charles Morton's Pupils.*

1. Mr. Samuel Lawrence, a native of Wem in Shropshire, born in 1661 ; who, after some time spent at Mr. Philip Henry's, and then at Mr. Malden's, at Alkinton, near Whitchurch, where he improved himself very much in Greek and Hebrew, went through a course of university learning under Mr. Morton. He was, first, for several years domestic chaplain to Lady Irby, relict of Sir Anthony Irby, of Westminster. In 1688, he accepted an unanimous invitation to become the minister of a congregation of

dissenters at Nantwich in Cheshire ; where he discharged the duties of his pastoral office, embracing all opportunities of doing good, with diligence and earnestness, for nearly 24 years. His whole conversation in the world, was blameness and earnest. He was a good scholar, and a judicious and serious preacher. He died April 4th 1712, in the 51st year of his age. Some of the last words he was heard to utter were, " I do not fear, I do not fear." His second son was the very amiable Dr. Samuel Lawrence,

many years pastor of the congregation in Monkwell-street, London.—Mr. Matt. Henry's funeral sermon for the father, p. 33—48; Dr. Fordyce's ditto for the son, p. 26—32.

2. Mr. John Beaumont, of whom we have already made mention, p. 250, 1.

3. Mr. Thomas Reynolds, born in London about the year 1667, and admitted into Mr. Morton's academy 1683. He afterwards studied at Geneva and Utrecht. He was invited, in 1695, to succeed Mr. Thomas Kentish, as minister of a small congregation in Cannon-street, London; which in a short time became numerous, and erected a new and more commodious place of worship, over the King's Weigh-House in Little East-cheap; where Mr. Reynolds continued his ministerial labours for above thirty years with celebrity and reputation, diligence and success, till 1727. He was one of the first six ministers, who conducted a lecture at the Weigh-House on Friday evening, and was one of the lecturers at Salters' Hall on a Tuesday. He took a distinguished part in the trinitarian controversy in 1719; and was a strenuous advocate for the

subscription required by many to the first article of the Church of England, and to the answers to the fifth and sixth questions in the assembly's catechism, through a misguided zeal imposing on others their own views of the christian doctrine. For a memoir of Mr. Reynolds, see Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, vol. i. p. 157, 172.

4. Mr. Joseph Hill, born the 11th of October 1667, in Salisbury; who on his removal from the free school of that city, into which he entered at the age of seven, and where he continued nine years, affording early specimens of a good genius for learning, was placed under the tuition of Mr. Morton; after the breaking up of whose seminary, he studied under Mr. Sprint, a dissenting minister, near Andover, under the learned Mr. Richard Stretton, and under Mr. Glascock. When he had finished his academical course, he spent seven years as chaplain in the family of Lady Irby. His first connection in the pastoral office was with a congregation of protestant dissenters in Swallow-street, St. James's. In 1699, he accepted an invitation from the English church at Rotterdam; where he con-

tinued his ministry for nineteen years, and was held in great respect by the Dutch as well as English Churches. On the 10th of February 1718, he became pastor of the congregation of dissenters of the presbyterian denomination, which then assembled at Haberdashers' Hall, where he succeeded Mr. Coningham. Here he laboured nearly eleven years, approving himself, though not a popular preacher, a learned, pious, and judicious divine. He died in his sleep on the 21st of January 1729. The congregation, which had declined in numbers for many years, dissolved itself in 1734, when Dr. Theophilus Lobb was its minister. *Wilson's Dissenting Churches*, vol. iii. p. 137—139.

5. Mr. William Hocker, a fellow student with Mr. Thomas Reynolds, was descended from respectable and religious parents, at Trelill, near Warbridge, in Cornwall, where he was born in 1662. He received the rudiments of classical learning from the Rev. Joseph Halsey, ejected from the rectory of St. Michael Penkevel in that county; whose house, on its being known, that for want of a convenient school, he had taken

on himself the instruction of his own children, was thronged with gentlemen's sons of the best rank, tho' many of them were averse from nonconformity. After Mr. Hocker had finished his academical course under Mr. Morton, he engaged as a chaplain to a worthy family at Edmonton, near London, where, besides his daily offices, he preached every Lord's day evening, on which service the neighbours were permitted to attend. The event was, that by this means he formed the first congregation of protestant dissenters in that place, which afterwards became respectable in numbers and wealth. Here he exercised his ministry, with energy and success in striking the conscience and healing the wounded mind, for above thirty years; when he accepted an invitation, in 1719, to be the colleague of Mr. Samuel Pompet, minister of the congregation, in Gravel-lane, Hounsditch. In this connection he died on the 12th of December 1721, greatly honoured, universally beloved, and much lamented; having exhibited a pattern of laborious diligence in the duties of his office, especially of indefatigable attention to visiting the sick and afflicted,

whether rich or poor ; and an amiable pattern of modesty, meekness, and humility.—A singular fact connects itself with his history. A young gentlewoman, a relation of his tutor, visiting Mr. Morton with her mother from Barbadoes, while he was a student, was much affected by the example of his piety. Previously to their leaving England, Mr. Hocker drew up and put into her hands a paper of christian counsel and advice. On their voyage back to Barbadoes these ladies were taken by a *Sallee* man, and carried away captives to *Mequinez*. They were stript of all they had, but the daughter found means of preserving this MS. The mother, after several years spent in captivity, was set at liberty, and came to England ; where she expressed a lively sense of the benefit and consolation she and her daughter had derived in their affliction from this paper, which was the only memorandum of christian principles they were permitted to keep.—The young lady, who was detained, was presented to the Emperor of Fez and Morocco. He was so captivated with her beauty, that no means of allurements to make her renounce

her religion, were unessayed. When these arts did not prevail, she was beaten in a most barbarous manner, her skin was laid open in several places, and fire was set to the gunpowder with which the interstices were filled. Yet she continued steadfast. When she was almost killed, the Emperor declared that he would marry her, notwithstanding her religious profession; which he did, and she became one of his four queens.—Reynolds's funeral sermon for Mr. Hocker, p. 36—55.

6. Mr. Joseph Bennet, whose father and grandfather were worthy ministers, the former ejected from Brightling in Suffex, was born in 1665, and received his grammar learning under Mr. Thomas Goldham, at Burwash in the same county, a polite scholar, whom the act of uniformity ejected from that vicarage. From whose seminary he removed to Mr. Morton's academy, to pursue a course of university studies ; of which in subsequent life he always spoke with singular pleasure, and of his tutor with great respect and veneration. He preached for some time, as a probationer, at Stratford in Essex. In 1692, June 22, he

and six other young ministers, viz. Mr. Joshua Bayes, Mr. Thomas Reynolds, Mr. Joseph Hill, Mr. Ebenezer Bradshaw, of Ramsgate in the county of Kent, Mr. William King, of Rumford in Essex, and Mr. afterwards Dr. Edmund Calamy, were solemnly ordained at Dr. Annesley's meeting-house in Little St. Helens. The service was conducted by Dr. Samuel Annesley, Mr. Vincent Alsop, Dr. Daniel Williams, Mr. Richard Stretton, Mr. Matthew Sylvester, and Mr. Kentish. This was the first instance of a *public* ordination in the city of London, after passing the Act of Uniformity; as those services had been performed till then with great caution and privacy. Mr. Bennet's first settlement after this was as a colleague with Mr. William Wickins, venerable for character and years, at Newington Green. In 1708, he was chosen assistant to the eminent Mr. Shower in this connection with whom, and with his successor Mr. Simon Brown, he continued his ministerial services to the congregation in the Old Jewry, greatly esteemed,

till his death, February 21, 1725, aged 61; supporting the character of a scriptural and judicious preacher, of the man of learning, and of the christian and minister, distinguished by modesty, humility, strict piety, and of an "Israelite in-deed, in whom there was no guile." The remark he made when he delivered the discourse, which proved his last sermon, from Luke ii. 14, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men," that he thought that a good subject to end with: and the text, Psalm ix. 10, "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee: for thou LORD hast not forsaken them that seek thee," on which he desired that his funeral sermon might be preached, and pressed on the hearts and attention of the hearers, as the sum of his own observation and experience; were expressive indications of the turn of his thoughts, and the excellent state of his mind. —Dr. Calamy's sermon for Mr. Bennet, p. 4, 34—46. Wilson's Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. p. 331—338.

IV. *Mr. Frankland's Pupils. To page 235.*

We have, probably, no list of students educated in the seminaries of dissenters so minute and full as that which was affixed by Dr. Latham, of the pupils of the above-named eminent tutor, to a funeral sermon for the Rév. Daniel Madock, of Uttoxeter, 26th May 1745. "When," as he expressed it, "many of those young lights were set as to us, but would shine out again in the firmament above." The date of the commencement of their academical course is specified against each. A correspondent under the signature of P. has republished this list through several numbers of the *Monthly Repository* for 1811, with such biographical notices as the information he had obtained could furnish. To these authorities the reader is referred; and this account will be confined to those names only, of whom we are able to supply some biographical notices from other quarters; prefixing to each name a number correspondent to the order in Dr. Latham's catalogue.

No. 3. Mr. Thos. Whitaker, 7th April 1670, was of a very antient family in Lancashire.

In 1676, he became minister to a large congregation of non-conformists in Call-lane, Leeds, and had a full share of the hardships and persecutions of the times; yet he was so respected by the mayor and aldermen, that they often absented themselves, when they had reason to expect the informers. At length one Kirkshaw lodged an information against him, and he was committed to the gaol in York, January 1683. This trial was aggravated by the death of his wife while he was in prison. After his liberation, he renewed and pursued his ministry in peace, and respected by all, till his death on Nov. 19, 1712, in the 34th year of his pastoral connection at Leeds. He left two sons; William, afterwards a physician in London, and Thomas, who succeeded him. His works were a volume of sermons on the parable of the unclean spirit; to which are annexed several funeral sermons: also two single sermons, viz. "Comfort for Parents mourning over their children dying young;" and "The Christian Sanctuary, or Room for returning Sinners." Mr.

Thomas Whitaker, jun. purchased the estate of Kirkshaw, the informer against his father; and actually relieved his posterity, greatly reduced by the vices of their parent.—MS. additions to a copy of Mr. J. Fawcett's "Life of Oliver Heywood," presented to the author of this History by the late R. W. Moulton, esq; of Wickersley, near Rotherham.

16. Mr. John Heywood, 26th May 1674, eldest son of Mr. Oliver Heywood, ejected from Coley, Yorkshire, settled first as a schoolmaster at Kirkheaton, in that county, 27th May 1678. He had previously to this spent some little time in the university of Glasgow. On the 23d August 1681, he was solemnly set apart to the work of the ministry; the service was conducted in a private house at Craven. See the Life of the Father, p. 127—8. November 18, 1684, he was appointed tutor to Thomas Westby, son and heir of — Westby, esq; of Ravenfield, near Rotherham. March 14, 1693, he was invited to become the minister of the congregation of dissenters in Rotherham. Soon after, on his marriage,

he left Mr. Westby's family, and fixed his residence in the town; where he remained about eight years, and then removed to Pontefract, at which place he died. Moulton's MS.

17. Eliezer Heywood, 26th May 1674, was ordained to the ministry, June 1st, 1687, at the house of his father; the service was conducted by his tutor Mr. Frankland, Mr. James Bradshaw, Mr. Dawson, Mr. John Iffot, and others. He then became domestic chaplain to Major Taylor, of Walling Wells, near Carlton, Nottinghamshire; and continued in this retired situation for several years. Soon after his marriage, January 18, 1700, he removed to Dromfield in Derbyshire, and preached to a small congregation there till his death. His son, educated under Dr. Latham, was pastor of the congregation at Mansfield, where he died about 1805. This gentleman's son, Mr. Samuel Heywood, a most excellent and amiable man, attorney at law, and town-clerk of Nottingham, died greatly lamented, 25th July 1789, aged 34. Moulton's MS. and Wakefield's Life, vol. i. p. 296, 299.

18. Mr. Thomas Cotton, 26th May 1674. This is the name in Dr Latham's list, and in Mr. Thompson's MS. on dissenting academies; but P. in the Repository, has it Colton. About the year 1715, there was a gentleman of this name, with the initials M. D. after it, minister of a congregation in the city of York.

22. Mr. John Nesbitt, June 28, 1674. He was a native of Northumberland, born 6th October 1661. His zeal for the protestant religion, expressed in the most public manner in the presence of the Duke of York, afterwards James II. exposed him to no light sufferings before he was twenty years of age. He was obliged to withdraw from Edinburgh, soon after he commenced his studies in the university there, and with some others to seek security in a foreign land. But going from London to Holland, they were seized, and committed close prisoners to the Marshalsea; where he was laid in irons, and confined for more than four months, in hopes of making him an evidence. But neither the evils he suffered, nor the advantageous offers made to him by the King in

council, could corrupt the integrity or shake the firmness of his mind. During his confinement he had no books except his Bible, which he was obliged to conceal, lest it should be taken from him. This he read much; and from the principles and exercises of devotion he derived such pleasure and consolation, that he often declared, in subsequent life, "the presence of God" made the prison a palace to "him." He died 27th October 1727, in the 67th year of his age; having been pastor of the same congregation, in Hare-Court, Aldersgate-street, London, thirty-three years, with great acceptance to the last. See Hurrion's funeral sermon for Mr. Nesbitt, p. 34—42. Wilson's Dissenting Churches, vol. iii. p. 282—286.

38. Mr. Nathaniel Heywood, 25th April 1677, was minister of a congregation at Ormskirk, from the vicarage of which town his father had been ejected; and died there October 26, 1704. See Fawcett's Life of Oliver Heywood, p. 133.

42. Mr. Joseph or Joshua Eaton was settled at Macclesfield in 1696; and according

to Dr. Clegg, removed first to Nottingham, and then to Colchester, and was afterwards a very useful physician in London, and reached to a very advanced age; for Dr. Grosvenor's "Essay on Health" is dedicated, with sentiments of great respect and gratitude, to Dr. Joseph Eaton, of the College of Physicians, London, second edition, 1748. See Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, 1798, vol. v. p. 403, note.

44. Mr. Peter Finch, 3d May 1678. According to Mr. Thompson's MS. and Neal's List of Dissenting Congregations and Ministers, he settled with the independent congregation at Norwich, in 1715. In which connection he died, having lived to bury three successive generations.

46. Mr. Thomas Lea, May 11, 1678. According to the preceding authorities, he was settled at Knutsford, Cheshire.

56. Mr. John Gledhill, through mistake, in the Monthly Repository, called Gleadhall, October 1st, 1678, born in Yorkshire, was the son of an excellent man, distinguished by knowledge and piety. He entered on the ministry when young, with great courage and zeal, in a time of persecution.

After a few years he settled at Colchester, where his peaceable spirit and prudent conduct restored and maintained the harmony of the congregation, which he found in a divided state. He fulfilled his ministerial duties with pleasure, fervour, and zeal; besides preaching twice every LORD'S day, catechising the young persons publicly every other Lord's day. He continued in this connection, beloved and respected by his people, for thirty-four years, to his death on December 20, 1727, in the 66th year of his age. Barker's funeral sermon for Mr. Gledhill, p. 32—36.

61. Mr. Adam Holland, March 2, 1680; according to Neal's MS. was M. D.

67. Mr. Abraham Dawson 13th April 1680; was settled at Cottingham, near Hull, in 1715. Neal's MS.

75. Mr. William Tong, 2d March 1680.

84. Mr. Nathaniel Priestly, Feb. 2, 1681; was settled at Halifax in 1715.

107. Mr. Joshua Bayes, Nov. 15, 1686; was minister of the congregation at Leather-lane, in Hatton-garden, London, in connection with Mr. Christopher Taylor. He published a funeral

sermon for that gentleman; a second for Mr. Cornish, also his colleague; and a third preached at Salters'-hall, against popery, on the worship of God in an unknown tongue. He had a brother, a respectable minister at Tunbridge; and author of a tract that excited attention, entitled "Divine Benevolence," 1731, in the controversy, on the spring of the divine actions, between this writer, Mr. Balguy, and Mr. Grove. See Doddridge's Divinity Lectures, by Kippis, vol. 1. p. 177—184.

112. Mr. John Piggot, 21st of January 1686; settled with a baptist congregation in Little Wild-street, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London; and died 1713, after a long sickness, during which the piety and charity which adorned his conversation in the time of his health, seemed to increase in strength and lustre. He was a man of learning; and his discourses, in which were happily blended reason and eloquence, were adapted at once to improve the mind and touch the heart. His publications were collected after his death, and reprinted in one volume 8vo. Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. iv. p. 315—319. A letter to his con-

gregation, 6th August 1708, is preserved in the Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, vol. vi. 1799, p. 221—223.

129. Mr. Samuel Baxter, 6th Feb. 1687, the son of Mr. Nathaniel Baxter, ejected from St. Michael's, Manchester, was pastor of the presbyterian congregation in Ipswich 39 years, and died July 19, 1740, aged 70. Monthly Repository, vol. iv. 1809, p. 6, note; and Palmer's Noncon. Mem. vol. ii. p. 101.

134. Mr. John Ash, May 7, 1688, was born at Tidefwell in Derbyshire, 11th Feb. 1672; the scenes of his ministry, to which he was ordained in the meeting-house at Malcass, 1696, were several congregations among the mountains called the *Peak*; amongst whom he laboured with diligence and earnestness till his death, Oct. 1, 1734, in the 64th year of his age. It marked good judgment and scrupulous reverence for the scriptures, that he never quoted texts from a sound of the words, but only such as in their real sense suited his design; for he esteemed it the greatest abuse of the sacred writings to press them into any service for which they were not intended.

His quotations from them were, therefore, though very frequent, always pertinent, and generally accompanied with a brief illustration; and he had a peculiarly happy talent in explaining an obscure text by a short clear paraphrase. *Protestant Dissenters' Mag.* vol. v. p. 404; where there is an interesting memoir of this excellent man.

143. Ratcliff Scolfield, 18th July 1688, was settled first at Whitworth in Lancashire; and in 1727 removed to Ringhay chapel in Cheshire.

190. James Wood, more correctly Woods, 22d April 1691, was the son of Mr. Jas. Woods, ejected from Ashton in Mackerfield. He settled with a congregation of dissenters at the old chapel in Chowbent, Lancashire, which he served with affection and fidelity in the spirit of meekness and piety above 60 years, dying February 1759. He is still remembered as a firm friend to the liberties of his country, and a facetious companion, as well as a faithful servant of the LORD JESUS. At the time of the rebellion in 1715, he headed a body composed of all the hale and courageous men of his congregation, armed with the instruments

of husbandry, and marched them to Preston, and secured the possession of Walton bridge, at the order of Gen. Wills. George I. acknowledged this brave and loyal conduct with an honourable memorial of his favour. Mr. Woods was, after this, called General Woods. When his society, through resentment of their steadiness to the cause of liberty, at the general election in 1722, were deprived of their place of worship, Mr. Woods, by his active exertions, procured assistance to erect the present large and commodious chapel. My son, H. Toulmin's *Life of Mr. John Mort*, p. 7, 8, 9.

200. Mr. Samuel Wood, 3d May 1692, successively minister at Wivenhoe, Essex; Lavenham, Suffex; Bishop-Stortford, Herts; and Woodbridge, Suffolk, where he died in September 1748. Thompson's MS.

201, 202. Samuel Dawson, Eli Dawson, May 13, 1692, sons of Mr. Joseph Dawson, ejected from Thornton chapel, Yorkshire. A brother of these gentlemen stands No. 67 on the list of Mr. Frankland's pupils. See *Theol. Rev.* ut ante, p. 326. Mr. Eli Daw-

son had seven sons; six of whom were educated dissenting ministers, but four of them afterwards conformed. Dr. Thos. Dawson, who united the profession of physic with the character of a divine, was for some years minister of the congregation at the Gravel Pit, Hackney; but before his death confined himself to the practice of physic, in which he was eminent. Dr. Benjamin Dawson began his public life as assistant to Mr. Read, at St. Thomas's, Southwark. After conforming he became rector of Burgh in Suffolk; and, it is apprehended, is still living. He is well known by several learned publications, especially in defence of religious liberty, and as author of a volume of sermons at Lady Moyer's lecture. Another brother, Mr. Abraham Dawson, rector of Ringsfield, Suffolk, published, in 1763, a new translation of the three first chapters of Genesis, and with notes critical and explanatory; and in 1772, a translation of the fourth and fifth chapters, on the same plan. The fourth brother, Eli Dawson, published a sermon from Psalms xviii. 46, on taking Quebec, in 1763, as

chaplain of his Majesty's ship Stirling-Castle.

219. Thomas Letherland, July 7, 1693, settled as a minister at Stratford, Thompson's MS.

256, 257. John Fletcher, and James Clegg, Feb. 26, 1696, were ministers of a congregation at Chapel le Frith, Derbyshire. The same.

230. Mr. Christopher Bafnett, 1st April 1696, was settled in Liverpool. The same.

231. Mr. Robert Murrey, 27th May 1696, appears to have settled first at Burton in Staffordshire, where he was ordained 2d August 1705. He removed afterwards to Chester about the year 1720; to the congregation of which Mr. Matthew Henry had been the pastor. His works were "Christ every Christian's Pattern," 12mo. "The Example of St. Paul represented to Ministers and private Christians out of the Acts of the Apostles, and his own divine letters," 12mo.; and "Closet Devotion," 12mo.

346. Mr. Richard Lessingham, 3d of April 1697, was minister, in 1715, at Newnam, Norfolk, where was

formerly a meeting. Thompson's MS.

347. Mr. Richard Chorley, was a native of the North, preached for some time at Framlingham in Suffolk, and afterwards conformed in a lay capacity. Id.

351. Mr. afterwards Dr. John Evans, 26th May 1698, was son of Mr. John Evans, Baliol college, Oxford, ejected from Ofwestry, Shropshire, afterwards pastor of the congregational church at Wrexham in Denbighshire; where this son was born, and afterwards settled as the pastor of another congregation. After some time he removed to London, first as assistant to, and then as co-pastor of, the congregation at Hand-alley in Bishopsgate-street. He died 23d May 1730, in the 51st year of his age; leaving behind him a name honoured for virtues, abilities, and influence; and of celebrity for many publications, particularly in a controversy with a learned divine, Dr. Cumming, on "the importance of Scripture Consequences;" and for two volumes of sermons on "the Christian Temper." See Harris's Funeral Discourses,

p. 285—296. Wilson's History, vol. ii. p. 212—221.

253. Mr. Thomas Wainman, 5th July 1697, settled at Bingley in Yorkshire, where he was minister about 1715.

535. Mr. Daniel Madock, 11th August 1697, was the son of a learned physician, Dr. Joshua Madock, at Whitchurch in Shropshire, the friend of Sir Isaac Newton. His first years were spent with Mr. Philip Henry's family; where he was early instructed in literature, and formed to piety. His family could be traced back through collateral branches and alliances to princes of the name of Madock, amongst the ancient Britons; to one of whom their historians, so early as the 12th century, ascribe the discovery of America. He entered on his ministry in the neighbourhood of Chester; from whence he removed and settled at Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, in 1709; where he died May 1745. His preaching was plain and easy, and adapted to the meanest capacity of his auditory; his manner of life was still, quiet, and inoffensive; though he constantly performed the public services of the

LORD'S Day, his tender constitution confined him almost entirely at home. Dr. Latham's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Madock, p. 27—31. N. B. Mr. Madock finished his academical studies under Dr. Benion. Dr. Latham has preserved a Latin letter of Sir Isaac Newton to Dr. Madock, on optics, dated Feb. 7th, 1679.

339. Mr. William Cook, Jan. 5, 1698.

342. Mr. John King, 22d March, 1698.

352. Mr. David Some, July 4, 1698. Dr. Latham says of Mr. Cook and Mr. Some, that they left a fragrant odour of their names.

Mr. John King, who was of the family of Lord Chancellor King, was a person of fine genius and the most polite parts; but too much resembled Mr. Madock in excess of modesty and the affectation of retirement. As they were almost uniform in their lives, they were not long divided in their deaths; and passed thro' the world like subterraneous streams, unheard and unknown. Latham's Sermon, p. 27, 28.

Mr David Some settled at Market-Harborough, and afterwards took upon him the pastoral care of a small society at

Kibworth, in conjunction with his own; in which he was for several years assisted by Mr. afterwards Dr. Philip Doddridge, to whom, next to Dr. Clarke, he was the best friend he ever experienced. Mr. Some died on the 29th of May 1737. He was a person of uncommon piety, zeal, prudence, and sagacity. He never printed more than two sermons; one in the year 1729, concerning the proper methods to be taken by ministers for the revival of religion; and another in 1736, at the funeral of the Rev. Thos. Saunders, of Kettering: a fatal modesty consigned to the flames with his dying breath those writings, "which," says Dr. Doddridge, "would have probably been the means of spreading among thousands that spirit of wisdom, piety, and love, into which the whole soul of the author seemed to be transformed." The doctor has preserved a remark of Mr. Some, as a specimen of his judgment and acuteness, on the finished hypocrisy of Judas Iscariot, viz. that this man is never found saying a word of Christ's temporal kingdom, though it is to be supposed that he followed

him from the hope of preferment and gain. Some years after Mr. Some's death, Dr. Doddridge published a judicious tract written by him, which was of considerable utility in removing the scruples of some worthy minds with respect to inoculation. Mr. Some, in conjunction with Mr. Norris, of Welford, and Mr. John Jen-

nings, of Kibworth, overruled an attempt, about the year 1723, to introduce subscription to articles of faith in words of human device, as a test of orthodoxy, at the time when the questions on that subject were agitated in London. Doddridge's Family Expositor, vol. ii. sect. 174, note d; Kippis's Life of Doddridge, p. 26, 27,

V. List of Mr. Doolittle's Pupils. To page 237.

1. Mr. Bozier. See before p. 242.

2. Mr. Matthew Henry. See his life by Mr. Tong.

3. Mr. Samuel Bury, who was first minister of a congregation at Edmund's-Bury in Suffolk; and in 1720 removed to that of Lewin's-Mead in Bristol, where he died. He published the life of his wife, a lady of eminent piety and distinguished virtues. He was contemporary at Mr. Doolittle's seminary with Mr. Matthew Henry, of whom he said, delineating his character with high encomiums, "he was to me a most desirable friend, "and I love Heaven better "since he went there."

Mr. Doolittle's academy was then kept at Islington, but the

iniquity of the times, that is, the malignant spirit of intolerance, obliged him first to remove to Battersea, and soon after to disperse his pupils into private families at Clapham, Henry's Life, p. 27, 12mo.

4. Mr. Henry Chandler, father of the learned and celebrated Dr. Samuel Chandler, was first settled at Malmesbury, and afterwards at Hungerford, in Wilts; but the greatest part of his ministry was exercised at Bath, where he died in 1719, and was succeeded by Mr. afterwards Dr. Benjamin Stevension. Mr. Chandler published, in 1705, a practical Treatise, entitled "Man's "Highest Happiness." In 1713, a charge delivered at the ordination of Mr. Joseph

Denham, at Gloucester, who afterwards became the pastor of Mr. Pompet's congregation in Alie-street, Goodman's-fields. Among other good advices addressed to Mr. Denham, he is exhorted to preach intelligibly; for if the preacher be in the clouds, it would be a strange thing if those that sit under his ministry be not in darkness. Another rule he lays down is, "to preach good sense, and to back it with strong scripture argument." In 1717, he introduced to the public from the press a sermon and charge delivered at the ordination of Mr. Thomas Morgan, who afterwards became a physician, and well known as the author of "The Moral Philosopher," by a preface, in which, to the credit of his good sense and liberal way of thinking, he argued, from the nature of the thing, and from the form of ordaining priests in the church of England, that ordination did not and could not give authority to the persons ordained. This was at a time episcopalians and presbyterians strenuously advanced and defended claims of communicating authority to preach and administer the or-

dinances of the gospel. Mr. Chandler had a son, Mr. John Chandler, an eminent apothecary in the city of London, and the author of a piece on Colds and Catarrhs, well received by the public, who lived to a great age: and a daughter, who discovered a peculiar taste for literature, and was much celebrated as the author of several poems, particularly one on Bath, in which city she resided. See my notes to the life of Dr. Samuel Chandler, in Protestant Dissenters Magazine for June 1794, p. 217, &c.

5. Mr. Ebenezer Chandler, who was the second pastor in succession, at the beginning of the last century, to the church formed by Mr. John Bunyan, the well-known author of "The Pilgrim's Progress." He was a worthy character; and under his ministry which was remarkably successful, the congregation increased so much as to require the erection of a larger meeting-house. Mr. Samuel Palmer's sermon, for Rev. Samuel Sanderfon, p. 21, 22, note.

6. Mr. Thomas Emlyn, eminent for great piety and learning, born at Stamford, in

Lincolnshire, 27th May 1663, and died July 30, 1741. His character, marked by an excellent spirit, particularly displayed under sufferings, the persecution which he sustained for his religious sentiments, and the temper, candour, and ability with which he asserted and vindicated the cause of what appeared to him important truth, have given a celebrity to his name, and perpetuity to his memory, which supersede any enlargement here. See *Biographia Britannica*, under the name of Emlyn.

7. Mr. afterwards Dr. Thomas Ridgley, a native of London, born about the year 1667, who succeeded Mr. Thomas Gouge, as pastor to the congregation, near the Three Cranes, Thames-street, London, and died on the 27th March 1734, became an eminent tutor, in conjunction with the learned and modest Mr. John Eames, of a seminary for academical education, founded and supported by the independent fund in London. Under this character his name will be entitled to respectful mention in a subsequent part of this history. See Wilson's History, vol. ii. p. 72—81.

8. Mr. Samuel Doolittle, the son of the tutor, was born about August 1662. He received his education under his father; and after he had laid in a good foundation of human literature and sacred knowledge, he spent about eighteen years of his ministry, as assistant to the Rev. John Turner, (who, after his ejection from Sunbury in Middlesex, had a private congregation in Fetter-lane,) and to his father. In 1700 he became the pastor of a congregation at Reading, where he died on the 10th of April 1717. In this connection he was assiduous in preaching, and in the instruction of youth, by catechistical exercises; displaying great ministerial abilities, and skill in the controversies of religion; for some years beloved and admired; but afterwards, because without ground suspected of inclining to some Arminian sentiments, condemned at the synod of Dort: he suffered greatly in his spirits from the unjust prejudices entertained against him by some, and by unhappy dissensions and feuds in the society, which hastened his death. This gave occasion for his friend, who had been

acquainted with him thirty-seven years, and knew that his sentiments on the extent of Christ's death were in union with the learned divines who were strenuous opposers of the Remonstrants, to remark in the sermon on his death; that, "if we be prejudiced against one another about *doubtful* points of religion, in which *learned* and *good* men entertain different sentiments, or use a *different manner of expression*, there must be a *weak head*, or a *corrupt heart*, which makes men judge of truth by a *party*, and offer a sacrifice of peace thereto." Waters's funeral sermon for Mr. Doolittle, p. 30, 31. Wilson's History, vol. iii. p. 200, 201.

9. Mr. John Motterhead, born in 1665, was willingly and cheerfully, in a time of persecution, during the reign of Charles II. educated for the christian ministry; and in the duties of it, under those temptations to ease and indulgence which the opulence of his fortune furnished, he persevered to the end of life. He was a contemporary at Islington with Mr. and afterwards Dr. Edmund Calamy; reading logic,

while the latter applied only to grammar. He imbibed under the ministry of his tutor an early sense of religion, and under his academical lectures made considerable progress both in human and divine literature; generally respected by his fellow students, as in the subsequent periods of his life he was by persons of the best reputation and worth. Before his appearance in public, he spent some time in Holland; where he formed an acquaintance with Monsieur Bayle, from whose conversation and lectures he derived great additions to his knowledge, especially in belles lettres: though, as he used to reflect with great thankfulness to God, he was preserved from the pyrrhonism into which that great man fell. On commencing his ministry, he was first a considerable time assistant to Mr. Goffe, pastor of a congregation at Kingston-upon-Thames, to whom he rendered his services gratis. He also assisted his tutor in the pulpit in Monkwell-street, approving himself both to him and to the congregation, by his pious life and useful preaching. In 1697, he removed to Ratcliffe, as

successor to Mr. George Day, who had been ejected from Wivelscombe in Somersetshire. Here he would have also given his services for nothing, if he had not been advised to the contrary by his father-in-law; who on this principle, that it would be a prejudice to those who should succeed him, dissuaded him from it. He was reserved in his natural temper, and fond of privacy and retirement; but was an example of beneficence and charity; and in his public ministry, he was governed by an earnest aim to honour God, and to edify his hearers; and spreading the knowledge of Christ among his people was his singular pleasure. He is reckoned to have translated into Latin some works of the learned Dr. Lightfoot. He died 13th October 1728. Wilson's History, vol. iii, p. 200.

10. Mr. Edmund Calamy, celebrated for the respectability of his character, the weight

of his influence, his controversy with Bishop Hoadly on the principles of nonconformity, and numerous publications, particularly the abridgement of Mr. Baxter's Life, and a continuation. This last work will perpetuate his name in Ecclesiastical History, and the execution of it will be an honourable memorial of his abilities and principles. See Biographia Britannica, by Kippis. Dr. Calamy was born on the 5th April 1671, and died 3d June 1732.

11. 12. Mr. after Dr. Kerr, M. D. and Mr. Thomas Rowe, who afterwards were themselves eminent tutors; the former, first at Highgate, and then in St. John's-square, Clerkenwell; the latter in London; and whose names and characters will claim a tribute of respect in a subsequent period of the history of Dissenting Academies.

13. Mr. Walters Bedford.

N. B. The preceding list is formed on the authority of Mr. Thompson's MS,

6. *Mr. John Shuttlewood's Pupils. To p. 239.*

1. Julius Saunders, who, at an early period of life, was entered at Oxford, with a view

of taking orders in the establishment; but after close and serious examination, he was

induced to take his lot among the dissenters. During the reign of Charles II. he suffered three years' imprisonment in the gaol of Warwick for his nonconformity. He formed an independent congregation at Bedworth, a populous village near Coventry; and was also the means of supporting, if not raising, another church of the same denomination in the city. He was a gentleman of great piety, but of the sternest cast; and for many years supported a character of great weight and influence in the neighbourhood; and his name is transmitted down to us as one who was "a burning and shining light." *Evangelical Mag.* p. 578, supplement to 1806; and *Protestant Dissenters' Mag.* 1797, p. 242.

2. Mr. Thomas Emlyn, in 1678, commenced his academical studies at this seminary, and spent four years in it; though, it is observed by his biographer, the obscure privacy of it did not suit his inquisitive mind, eagerly thirsting after knowledge; for he was kept unacquainted with the learned world, and could see but very few books, and those chiefly of one sort. *Memoirs of his Life*, p. 6; and before the

list of Mr. Doolittle's pupils.

3 Mr. Ebenezer Wilson, son of the Rev. John Wilson, many years pastor of the baptist congregation at Hitchin, Herts, and father of the Rev. Samuel Wilson, a popular minister of a church of the same denomination in Goodman's fields, London. Mr. Ebenezer Wilson received his academical education partly, also, under Mr. Jollie, at Attercliffe. He was for some years settled with a congregation at Bristol, as assistant to Mr. Thomas Vaux, pastor at Broadmead. In 1704 he accepted an invitation to the pastoral office in a baptist congregation at Turner's hall, London; which, though small, consisted of some wealthy persons, by whom he was greatly respected, and who contributed liberally to his support. He was a worthy man and a scholar, but not popular as a preacher. *Crosby*, vol. iv. p. 326—328; & *Wilson's Hist.* vol. i. p. 144.

4. Mr. John Sheffield, son of the Rev. William Sheffield, ejected from Ibstock in the county of Leicester, by the Act of Uniformity; under the pressure of which Act he and his son continued to groan all their days. He was intended

for trade, but the strong bent of his mind for learning determined his father to place him under the tuition of Mr. Shuttlewood, then a resident in the neighbourhood; "a worthy and learned man," says Dr. Calamy, "who deserved much better treatment than he met with from an ill-natured world;" and whom Mr. Sheffield followed in his several removals, pursuing his studies with great diligence and application. He entered into public life with a mind well stored with useful knowledge, and with a warm heart, preaching as one who did himself believe what he delivered to others. He had studied his bible diligently, making that his only standard, and was reckoned by the great Mr. Locke, whom he often met with at a friend's house in Essex, to understand it well, and to excel in explaining difficult texts. He began his ministry, for a continuance, at Temple-hall in Leicestershire, where he officiated as chaplain to a lady, whose name was Palmer, and opened a meeting-house for stated religious worship; preaching also at Atherstone, and in the course of the week making frequent excursions

into the country to preach lectures. In 1697 he was invited, on the death of Mr. Nathaniel Vincent, to succeed him as pastor of the congregation of dissenters at St. Thomas's, Southwark. In this connection he remained to his death on Jan. 24, 1726, aged 73; assisted at one time by Mr. Joshua Bayes, and then Mr. Henry Read, as his colleagues. He was a man of great integrity and plain-heartedness, an enemy to dissimulation. His charity was not confined to a party, but embraced all who adhered to the common Head; an advocate for catholic christianity, he disapproved of the national establishment, and was contented to decline the emoluments of it; for "he thought it set up such a sort of *uniformity* as hindered *unity*, and turned the *national church* into a mere party." Where he thought the honour of God and the religious edification of men were concerned, his courage was undaunted, and his mind not to be intimidated from its purposes. His affairs were managed with discretion, and without much noise; his favourite motto being, "*Qui bene latuit, bene vixit.*" He

maintained in all respects very mild deportment towards his colleagues and brethren in the ministry, by whom he was greatly respected. In the latter years of his life his piety and resignation were greatly exercised by very painful disorders; and on opening his body after his death two stones were extracted, one from the bladder, smooth, not so large as is often seen, and so lodged as probably not to come often at the neck of the bladder; the other, rough, craggy, and very large, filling up the whole *pelvis* of the kidney, with several protuberances, and a rough spike of considerable length, which ran into the *ureter*. He bore the exquisite pain occasioned by these concretions with remarkable patience, and even composure; and in moments of great uneasiness and acute sensation, often answered the enquiries of his friends with a smile that expressed the serenity of his mind. His greatest depression of spirits arose from being laid aside from his work; but when complain-

ing that he was quite useless, he would recollect himself and express the resignation of his Blessed Master, who in the severest trials said, "Father, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." He was an excellent man, greatly honoured, living and dying. Calamy's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Sheffield, p. 33—40. He left a son, Mr. Wm. Sheffield, in the ministry.

5. Mr. Matthew Clarke;

6. Dr. Joshua Oldfield;

N. B. These gentlemen are named by the late Mr. Samuel Palmer (Noncon. Memor. v. ii. p. 126, 1st ed.) as students under Mr. Shuttlewood; but it is apprehended the author was misinformed. The former, we have seen before, received his academical learning under Mr. Woodhouse; the latter, Dr. Harris informs us, studied philosophy under Mr. Rayner, and then resided some time in Christ's college, Cambridge, in the latter years of those learned and excellent persons, Dr. Henry Moore and Dr. Cudworth. Fun. Dis. p. 380.

VII. *Mr. Cradock's Pupils. To page 239.*

1. Mr. Robert Billio, who was Mr. Matthew Henry's immediate successor as minister

of the congregation in Mare-street, Hackney.

2. Mr. Porter, who settled with a congregation at Nayland, Suffolk.

3. Sir Francis Brickley, of Attleborough, Norfolk.

4. Mr. Paget, gent.

5. ** Warner, of Bunsfield, Suffolk, esq.

6. Roger Rant, of Swaffam, Cambridgeshire, esq.

7. Dr. Edmund Calamy. The following gentlemen were his fellow students:

8. Charles Lord Fitzwilliam, Moulsham-hall, Essex.

9. Mr. Henry Martin.

10. Mr. Corbet, of Shropshire; who afterwards applied himself to the study of the law in London.

11. Henry Ashurst, esq; son of Sir Wm. Ashurst, afterwards town-clerk of London.

12. Mr. after Capt. Roll.

13. Mr. George Mayo, only son of Israel Mayo, of Beyford, Herts, esq.

14. Mr. John Godfrey.

15. Wm. Ellis, esq; eldest son of Sir William Ellis, of Norton, Lincolnshire, who afterwards died in Holland.

16. Mr. Timothy Goodwin,

a good Grecian, who was designed for physic; but afterwards turned his attention to divinity. He took orders in the church; travelled as chaplain with Lord Shrewsbury, when he went over lord lieutenant to Ireland; and was first bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, and then was advanced to the archiepiscopal see of Cashel. He died 1729.

There were several other young gentlemen of good families. Amongst those wholly fixed for divinity were

16. Mr. Joseph K. nish, son of Mr. Thomas K. nish.

17. Mr. Thomas Bantoft, son of the Rev. Samuel Bantoft, ejected from the vicarage of Stebbing in Essex. He afterwards died insane.

18. Mr. John Keeling, probably the son of the Rev. Francis Keeling, ejected from Cogshot in Shropshire. He settled with a congregation at New Sarum, and then removed to Cirencester where he died in 1726.

Dr. Calamy's History of his own Life and Times, MS. 109, 110, 111.



